

Authors: Demetra Smith Nightingale  
Sue E. Poppink  
Regina M. Yudd

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS STUDY

REPORT ON CENSUS OF STATE OPERATIONS:  
COMPUTER MATCHING

FINAL REPORT

February 1987

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Food and Nutrition Service  
3101 Park Center Drive  
Alexandria, VA 22302

Prepared by:

The Urban Institute  
2100 M St. N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by The Urban Institute under contract No. FNS 53-3198-5-51 from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Analysis and Evaluation, on subcontract from Mathematica Policy Research.

This report represents a team effort in which a number of individuals made important contributions in addition to the authors. We gratefully acknowledge their assistance. We particularly want to acknowledge the sustained help and support of Boyd Kowal, Jill Herndon, and Chris Kissmer of the Food and Nutrition Service.

The authors would also like to thank the many individuals from

---

Mathematica Policy Research and The Urban Institute who participated in the computer matching portion of the Program Operations Study and contributed to the development of this report. Particular recognition goes to Linda Wray of Mathematica Policy Research who coordinated and supervised the census survey, Neal Jeffries of The Urban Institute who programmed and managed the computer matching data file, and Mildred Woodhouse of The Urban Institute who prepared the final manuscript. Finally, we are most grateful for the cooperation of those state officials and staff who provided information on computer matching in their states and shared their substantial knowledge with us.

Demetra Smith Nightingale  
Sue E. Poppink  
Regina M. Yudd

## CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	vii
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Goals of the Census on Computer Matching.....	1
B. Data Collection Methods.....	4
C. Scope of the Census Results.....	6
D. Organization of the Report.....	7
II. EXTENT OF COMPUTER MATCHING IN THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM.....	9
A. Introduction .....	9
B. Definitional and General Aspects of Computer Match Systems.....	9
C. Coverage of the Relevant Issues by the Computer Match Systems.....	12
D. Data Sources Used for Computer Matching.....	16
III. STATE ROLES AND POLICIES ON COMPUTER MATCHING.....	29
A. Introduction.....	29
B. General Features of State Computer Matching Policies.....	29
C. State and Local Roles in Computer Matching....	35
D. Special Matches Conducted by the States.....	40
E. Summary.....	45
IV. STATE COMPUTER MATCHING TYPOLOGIES.....	47
A. Specification of the Comparative Dimensions...	47
B. Categorization of the States.....	49
APPENDIX A - SUMMARY TABLES OF COMPUTER MATCHING CENSUS RESULTS	
APPENDIX B - SUMMARY OF MATERIALS SUBMITTED BY STATES ON COMPUTER MATCHING	
APPENDIX C - COPY OF COMPUTER MATCHING CENSUS INSTRUMENT	

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE II.1	- Number of Computer Matching Systems in the Food Stamp Program, by Purpose of Match and Type of Access.....	11
TABLE II.2	- Timing of Front-End Matching Performed in the Food Stamp Program, by Type of Access.....	13
TABLE II.3	- Timing of On-Going Matching in the Food Stamp Program, by Type of Access.....	15
TABLE II.4	- Number of Food Stamp Matching Systems by Year of Introduction of Routine Matching	17
TABLE II.5	- Number and Percentage of Matching Systems Using Various Data Sources.....	18
TABLE II.6	- Length of Time Required to Perform the Match by the Number of Food Stamp Matching Systems.....	24
TABLE II.7	- Length of Time Required for Results of Food Stamp Matching to Reach Local Offices, by Number of Matching Systems..	26
TABLE III.1	- Distribution of Computer Matching Systems Used in State Food Stamp Programs, 1986.....	30
TABLE III.2	- Number and Percentage of States Using Data Bases for Computer Matching in the Food Stamp Program.....	32
TABLE III.3	- States' Use of Wage Information by Source of Data.....	34
TABLE III.4	- Number of States Using Social Security Administration Files for Computer Matching in the Food Stamp Program.....	36
TABLE III.5	- States Requiring Local Reports on Computer Matching Activity in the FSP...	39
TABLE IV.1	- Categorization of States by Intensity of Computer Matching Policies as of 1986	51

TABLE IV.2	- Range of Data Bases Used for Computer Matching, by State .....	52
TABLE IV.3	- Mode of Access for Computer Matching Procedures, by State .....	53
TABLE IV.4	- Maturity of Computer Matching Operations, by State.....	54
TABLE IV.5	- Categorization of States Based on Intensity of CM Policy and Range of Data Bases Used.....	55



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Computer verification of client-reported information using external data bases, or computer matching, is used to varying degrees by the state food stamp agencies. Accordingly, the Food and Nutrition Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has sponsored research to: (1) determine the extent of computer matching in the Food Stamp Program (FSP), (2) develop a descriptive profile of state-level or state-directed computer matching activities and, (3) address the considerable variation among states. Computer matching is one of six topics covered in a study of Food Stamp Program operations, being carried out by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., with The Urban Institute and Abt Associates Inc. as subcontractors.

The first phase of the study involved interviews with food stamp personnel in the 50 states, plus the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Questions in the computer matching component of the interviews covered the number of matching systems, the type of external data base(s) accessed by each of the systems, the timing of the matches and currency of information in the data bases as well as reporting requirements between the state and local offices. Several open-ended questions in the document elicited comments on the effectiveness of matching and also elicited state reactions to the new Income Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) regulations. It should be noted that the Phase I interviews were conducted in mid-1986 and prior to the October 1, 1986 implementation date of the Income Eligibility Verification Systems (IEVS) regulations. Phase II interviews will document additional systems created by state or local agencies in response to the IEVS regulations.

### EXTENT OF COMPUTER MATCHING IN THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The state census identified a total of 248 distinct computer matching systems in use nationwide in the FSP. The major characteristics of the 248 are: (1) the purpose of the match (front-end verification of information on applicants versus on-going verification of information on recipients), (2) the method by which an agency accesses and uses the external data files (batch or on-line access).



Within the above context, the major characteristics of the 248 systems are summarized here and presented in detail in Chapter II of the report.

#### Purpose of the Match\*

- o 107 systems (43%) are used exclusively for on-going matching
- o 105 systems (42%) are used for front-end and on-going matching
- o 34 systems (14%) are used exclusively for front-end matching

#### Type of Access\*

- o 53 systems (21%) have on-line access
- o 193 systems (78%) systems have batch access

#### Timing of the Front-End Batch Matching Systems\*

- o 45 of 91 systems (50%) are used to conduct matching monthly
- o 12 of 91 systems (13%) are used to conduct matching daily
- o 13 of 91 systems (14%) are used to conduct matching weekly
- o 8 of 91 systems ( 9%) are used to conduct matching quarterly

#### Timing of Front-End On-Line Matching Systems\*

- o 21 of 48 systems (44%) are used to conduct matching immediately at application
- o 18 to 48 systems (38%) are used to conduct matching daily on all new applicants that day
- o 7 to 48 systems (15%) are used to conduct matching weekly, monthly, other on all new applicants that period

#### Timing of On-Going Batch Matching Systems\*

- o 79 of 176 systems (45%) are used to conduct matching monthly
- o 40 of 176 systems (23%) are used to conduct matching quarterly
- o 21 of 176 systems (12%) are used to conduct matching at recertificatiion
- o 36 of 176 systems (20%) are used to conduct matching at other intervals

#### Timing of On-Going On-Line Matching Systems\*

- o 18 of 36 systems (50%) are used to conduct matching at recertification
- o 9 of 36 systems (25%) are used to conduct matching at worker option
- o 9 of 36 systems (25%) are used to conduct matching semi-monthly, monthly, annually or at other intervals.

### Maturity of the Matching Systems\*

- o 62 systems (25%) were first used between 1969 and 1979
- o 67 systems (27%) were first used between 1980 and 1983
- o 111 systems (45%) were first used between 1984 and mid-1986

### Data Sources Used

Twenty-five data sources are used for computer matching in the Food Stamp Program, ranging from state wage and unemployment files and files from the Social Security Administration to files from miscellaneous sources, such as financial institutions (banks), worker's compensation, child-support files and any data files for any state supplementary payments. The two primary sources of data are unemployment insurance files (accessed by 77 systems) and wage files (accessed by 72 systems).

### Use of Matching Systems by Other Programs

Nearly all the computer matching systems are used by several programs administered by state welfare agencies. Only 24 (10%) of the 248 systems are used by FSP only. That is, 224 (90%) of the systems are used by at least one other program.

- o 220 (88%) are used by FSP and AFDC
- o 173 (69%) are used by FSP and Medicaid
- o 64 (26%) used by FSP, AFDC, Medicaid

### STATE AND LOCAL ROLES IN COMPUTER MATCHING

Examination of computer matching from a state perspective provides insight into the role of the states in the matching process. Major findings on states are summarized here and presented in more detail in Chapter III of the report.

### Distribution of Matching Systems

In 1986, all states and territories except Ohio, conducted regular computer matching on the FS caseload. Twelve states (23%) had 1-3 different matching systems. Thirty states (57%) had 4-6 different systems, and ten states (19%) had 7 or more unique computer matching systems.

---

\*Percentages will not all sum to 100% since information on some matching systems is missing.

### Coverage of FSP Caseload

Forty-eight states conducted front-end matching on FS applicants (91% of the states). Fifty-two states conduct on-going matching on active FS cases (98% of the states).

### Data Sources for Routine Matching

UI files are the primary data source for matching, used by 48 states (91% of the states). Employer wage files are used by 45 states (85%); SSI benefits are matched by 34 states (64%); and Social Security benefits are matched by 32 states (60%).

### State and Local Interaction

The process of computer matching involves activities at both the state and local levels. Specifically, three types of activities were addressed in the census; (1) state and local interaction for conducting a match, (2) case activities taken as a result of the match, and (3) reporting requirements established for local offices by the states.

The actual initiation of the match may occur at the local office. On-line, immediate computer access to at least one computer matching system exists in twenty-six of the states.

There is much variation in terms of what local FSAs report to the state agency about computer matching. Reporting requirements include turnaround documents (required in four states) or regular aggregate reports (14 states) on, for example, "hits", reconciliations, and claims cases. Twenty-three different states require local offices to submit some reports on matching but few states require local offices to submit information about matching from all systems.

### Special Matches

In addition to the routine matching functions undertaken on a regular basis, some states use their data processing capabilities to perform "special" or one-time only matches. The two broad categories for this type of match are; (1) state-directed test matches using in-state files from other programs or the various data files of a neighboring jurisdiction, and (2) matching against federally generated data bases. Thirty state agencies reported special matching using at least one type of special match, and 15 of those agencies conducted more than one type of special match during the last two years.

### State Perceptions on Matching

The general comments about computer matching were almost uniformly positive and most respondents were anticipating the development of new, more efficient matching systems or networks in the future. Most respondents felt the wage and UI matches were generally the most effective in terms of reducing the number of erroneous certifications, but expressed concerns about the time lag for reporting to the source agency and the subsequent problems related to the currency of the information in the data bases.

Respondents identified three aspects of the new IEVS regulations that they feel are particularly burdensome: (1) the requirement to match on employer wage-reporting data, IRS data and SSA wage data; (2) the requirement to conduct matching on all food stamp clients; and (3) the requirement that 100% of all "hits" be "followed up" within 30 days.

Although the comments about IEVS generally reflected concern about the increased effort required of states, a few respondents did express positive reactions. Several agencies mentioned that although the IRS data are not timely, matching on the IRS data base will at least provide some access to financial resources and unearned income that has not previously been available.

### STATE COMPUTER MATCHING TYPOLOGIES

The structured nature of the data collected in the census allows for the development of comparative state typologies. The following four dimensions form the basis for the typologies described in Chapter IV.

- o Mode of access
- o Range of data bases
- o Intensity of state policies
- o Maturity of matching operations

The first three dimensions were created by combining several independent characteristics identified by the census, the fourth is a single descriptive characteristic. The four dimensions are by no means the only important characteristics of state computer matching policies, but they do represent several of the critical differences among states in their approaches toward computer matching.

About half of the states limit their matching to the primary sources of data (UI, wage, SSA and files internal to the welfare/food stamp agency), and the other half also match against some other external data bases (e.g., department of motor vehicles, banks or tax agencies). A large proportion of the latter agencies conduct matching frequently. This may suggest that those state agencies that use many data bases and conduct matches on a relatively frequent basis are similar in other ways.

Another observation resulting from the above typology indicates that of the ten states reporting no exclusive front-end matching on applicants, seven of these conduct monthly matching on the entire caseload and use external files as well as wage, UI and SSA information. This may indicate that frequent ongoing matching is conducted in lieu of actual front-end matching (at application). In the case of this specific typology, the grouping of states might allow for examination of (1) the marginal contribution of having both front-end matching and different frequencies of on-going matching, and (2) the operational tradeoffs between actual front-end matching (i.e., at application) and routine matching of the entire caseload each month.

Simple two-fold typologies based on the four comparative dimensions discussed in the report can be used to expand the analysis of computer matching in the FSP and to develop other typologies that may be of particular research, policy or operational interest.

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report describes the results of a series of interviews concerning Computer Matching Systems used by Food Stamp Agencies (FSA's). The interviews were conducted as part of the first phase of the Food Stamp Program Operations Study (FSPOS), conducted by Mathematica Policy Research Inc., under contract to the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, with The Urban Institute and Abt Associates, as subcontractors. Other topics covered in this first phase of the study, referred to in this report as the "census" of state agencies, are: Automated Certification Systems, Claims Collection, Monthly Reporting, Quality Control, and Job Search activities. The results of these five other topic areas are presented in companion reports.

The Program Operations Study will consist of three phases of data collection and analysis. The first phase, the "census," has entailed telephone interviews with state agency staff in the 53 state-level Food Stamp Agencies (including Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) concerning practices and procedures in the six areas of Food Stamps named above. In the second phase, for which data were collected in October-November 1986, claims collection and computer matching operations are being analyzed in a national sample of 191 local agencies. Finally, in the spring of 1987, the third phase of the study will be carried out, consisting of intensive assessments of selected sites, focussing on the assessment of the costs and benefits of particularly promising examples of operations identified in the first two phases of the study.

This introductory chapter first outlines, in Section A, the goals of the census interviews on Computer Matching (CM). In Section B, a brief discussion is presented on the sources of the CM data, including a description of the agency sample and the interviewing methods used. Section C discusses the scope of the data collected, and Section D describes the organization of the remainder of this report.

### A. GOALS OF THE CENSUS ON COMPUTER MATCHING

Computer matching is the automated process of matching information about individuals across different data files (or data bases). Since the 1970s state welfare agencies have been conducting some form of computer matching to corroborate client information or to detect discrepancies in information. The original purpose (and still the main purpose) was to identify individuals who were applying for or receiving Aid to Families

with Dependent Children (AFDC) but had unreported wages that would make them ineligible for welfare or reduce their benefits. By the end of the 1970s, welfare agencies had expanded the wage matching to food stamp households as well as AFDC recipients. States were required by Congress to wage-match their AFDC caseloads beginning in October 1970, and wage matching in the food stamp program (FSP) was mandated beginning in January 1983.

For food stamps, computer matching has three general purposes: (1) verifying eligibility and benefits amounts, (2) investigating payment errors, and (3) substantiating information to be used in prosecutions. The matching can take place at intake to verify the eligibility of new applicants, at recertification to verify the continuing eligibility of current recipients, or at some other periodic interval (e.g. monthly or quarterly) to detect any inconsistencies in information on ongoing current rates. The computer matching process essentially is the initial match across data files, followed by the full range of subsequent follow-up activities, such as fraud prosecution, administrative disqualification, and claim collections.

The primary purpose of the census interviews on Computer Matching (CM) in the food stamp program was to develop a clear, descriptive profile of state-level or state-directed computer matching activities and to address the considerable variation among states in terms of (1) integration with matching done by other public assistance programs, (2) the types of data bases used, (3) the methods used to conduct matches, and (4) the frequency of matches.

Also to be addressed was the variation among states in terms of post-matching activity, such as requirements for reporting, case prioritization, and the level and type of information reported to the local agency as a result of the state-directed matching.

Specifically, the following topics were covered by the FSPOS computer matching census:

o Types of matching being conducted

- a. Access: On-line/batch
- b. Timing: Front-end/on-going
- c. Data bases matched
- d. Turnaround time
- e. Schedule (for ongoing matching): Periodic/at recertification
- f. Frequency (for periodic matching): Monthly, quarterly, annually

- o Techniques used in performing matches
  - a. Case identifiers used
  - b. Discrepancy codes used
  - c. Update period and time lapse for each external data source
  - d. Prioritizing of cases for subsequent follow-up action
  - e. Coverage: active cases only vs. active and inactive cases
- o Information or direction provided to local FSA's for follow-up
  - a. Content of forms or reports required
  - b. Format of match reports
- o Tracking procedures employed by state FSA's
  - a. State reporting requirements for local FSA's
  - b. Frequency of local reporting
  - c. Actions taken by states to ensure follow-up

A clear, descriptive profile of the above aspects of state-level or state-generated computer matching functions was the primary goal of the CM interviews. However in the course of census design and subsequent interviews, several other topics emerged and are reflected in the data collection instrument and the data presented in this report. At the request of FNS, questions concerning the nature and dates of any special, or one-time only, computer matches conducted by the states in addition to their routine matching activities were also included in the instrument. An open-ended question designed to elicit responses on the general perception of the effectiveness of computer matching was also included. Responses to this question often made reference to the new Income Eligibility Verification Regulations (IEVS), which will require state agencies beginning October 1, 1986 to verify household circumstances against external sources of information. The comments and reactions to IEVS are documented in this report. However, the primary focus of the interview, and of the results reported here, is to present a clear descriptive profile of the state-level or state-generated computer-matching activities undertaken as of mid-1986.



## B. DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Three aspects of the CM census provide useful background to the presentation of results: (1) a description of the agencies covered in the interviews; (2) a general overview of how the interviews were conducted, and (3) the use of materials received from state agencies.

### Description of the CM Sample

The general aim of the CM census is the development, through interviews with the state FSA staff, of a clear descriptive profile of computer matching systems used in each state. To this end, 53 telephone interviews were conducted with staff in each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands. While variations do exist in a state's administration of the food stamp program (state-supervised/state operated vs. state supervised/county administered programs), the CM instrument was designed to take into account these variations, as well as any matching systems operating in only part of the state, such as the Overnight Clearance System which operates for New York City only.

The computer matching systems covered in the survey reflect both the variety across states and the rapid pace of system development in the past few years. The systems described in this report are those that were in place and operating at the time of the interviews (summer 1986). In many states, system enhancements are occurring continuously; so it must be recognized that the descriptions in this report are a snapshot of state capabilities that will continue to develop.

### Interviewing Methods

Structured interview instruments to be administered by phone were developed after extensive review of data and information already available from FNS files, earlier research, and state reports to FNS. After review and clearance by FNS and OMB, a pre-test of the instrument was conducted with three state agencies--Connecticut, Tennessee and Texas. The staff in these states were very helpful and the pre-test resulted in substantial revisions to improve clarity and completeness. Interview respondents were nominated by state FSP directors or their delegates in preliminary telephone discussions with senior FSPOS research staff. In most instances a single respondent was suggested, most often a staff member involved in development of policy and procedures, or staff involved in the actual implementation of computer matching systems. In some instances, the FSP director suggested several different respondents for particular parts of the instrument. Even when a single respondent was suggested, however, interviewers often encountered situations in which the primary respondent could not

supply answers to specific questions; interviewers then requested a referral to other agency staff and initiated contacts with them as needed. Of the 53 agency interviews completed, 35 involved contacting more than one respondent. The interviews for this operations area generally lasted about one hour and forty-five minutes.

Although the CM instrument consisted primarily of structured response questions, the interviewing method involved a great deal of discussion of the questions and probing for clarification of responses. Every completed interview was reviewed by the senior project researcher responsible for the CM topic. These reviews identified apparent contradictions among interview responses and answers which, based on other information provided, appeared to reflect interpretation of interview terminology that departed from the interview intent. As the interviews proceeded, these reviews also identified the need for further clarification of the intent of specific questions and their interpretation in the context of particular system characteristics. These reviews prompted the preparation of "question clarification" statements distributed to interviewers to guide them in future administration of particular interview questions and also led to interviewer call-backs to respondents to clarify or confirm responses and to probe further to resolve what appeared to be contradictory information. Call backs were made for this purpose to almost every respondent FSA.

Use of  
Materials  
from State  
Agencies

In addition to the data collected in the telephone interview, states were also asked to provide descriptive program materials on computer matching activities. Various documents were forwarded to our offices by thirty-two states and jurisdictions. The types of materials provided range from descriptions of matching systems currently in use, to handbooks for eligibility workers conducting matches. Thirty-three states provided the relevant portions of policy and procedures manuals, and some states provided billing information and management reports on computer matching. A complete list of program materials provided by the states is included in Appendix B to this report.

The materials provided by the state agencies presented important contextual background for analysis of the interview data. In some cases, information available in these materials provided responses to specific interview questions, which saved time in the interviews. In other instances, where the complexity or subtlety of a state's procedures or systems could not be completely captured in the structured interview responses, the background materials were used to ensure correct interpretation.



Therefore, effectiveness data gathered as a result of these interviews are generally limited to the respondents' perceptions on the effectiveness of computer matching.

#### Definitional Variation

During the course of the interviews, several definitional variations were identified across states. Two are mentioned here because they are related to critical dimensions of matching systems.

- o RAW HITS: Although commonly perceived to be those cases where client-provided information is different from information in the external data base, many of the states define a "hit" as any case with any information on the external data base, i.e. locating or connecting the client identifier(s) with the source data base. The next phase of the study will involve closer examination of the precise definition of a "hit".
- o FRONT-END MATCHING: For purposes of the census interviews, the category of front-end matching includes any daily, weekly, or monthly matching done on applicants before initial certification, as well as instances when an agency includes new applicants among the routine on-going matching done during a particular time period. This broad definition was used to ensure that all possible variations of "front-end" matching were included in the census.

#### D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The remainder of this report is organized in the following manner. Chapter II addresses the extent of computer matching in the food stamp program, by describing the status of computer matching systems currently in use nationwide and the types of data bases accessed by these systems. Chapter III addresses state policies on matching in the food stamp program, issues related to the cost-effectiveness of computer matching and state reactions to the new IEVS regulations. Chapter IV presents a general typology for comparing state computer matching policies and processes. Detailed tables in Appendix A present the census results, a list of materials received from states is included in Appendix B, and the CM interview instrument appears as Appendix C.



## II. EXTENT OF COMPUTER MATCHING IN THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

### A. INTRODUCTION

As a result of the census interviews, 248 computer matching systems were identified as being in use nationwide in the food stamp program.<sup>1/</sup> System descriptions, operations and policies for their use are discussed in this chapter. Discussion of the extent of computer matching in the food stamp program centers on two basic dimensions: the purpose of the match and the type of access with which a local agency obtains matching information using that system. Within this context, various specifications of the 248 systems are discussed in Section C including: the timing of the matches (the specific time at which the applicant or recipient information is subjected to the match), the use of matching systems by other public assistance programs and the maturity of the systems. The types and sources of information accessed by the 248 systems are discussed under the heading "Data Sources Used for Computer Matching", Section D, in which the 25 different data sources utilized by the systems are described. This section also discusses the frequency of use of these data sources and the currency of information available from the data sources; the length of time required for the entire match process (allowing for exchange of information between the local and state agencies) and the type of information received by the local agencies.

### B. DEFINITIONAL AND GENERAL ASPECTS OF COMPUTER MATCH SYSTEMS

Two hundred and forty-eight distinct computer matching systems were identified in use in the food stamp program nationwide on a routine and regular basis in mid 1986. Two hundred and forty-one of these systems are used on a statewide basis and the other seven are used in selected local areas.<sup>2/</sup> Appendix Table A-1

---

<sup>1/</sup>A computer matching system as identified by the state census of the Food Stamp Program Operations Study meets the following criteria: (1) it is conducted on a regular basis or a routine schedule (as opposed to a special or one time only match) and (2) it is conducted by an automated process (as opposed to a manual matching process).

<sup>2/</sup>This phase of the Program Operations Study focuses on states. Thus, the 248 computer matching systems described in this report are those systems identified at the state level (i.e., they are generally developed, administered, maintained or coordinated at the state level). The next phase of the study will identify any additional computer matching systems developed or maintained by local jurisdictions or programs.

lists these computer matching systems by state. Two dimensions are used to categorize these systems: (1) the purpose of the match, and (2) the method for defining the systems and accessing data.

Purpose of  
The Match

Computer matching systems are used for two fairly separable purposes in the food stamp program (FSP):

- o verification of income, eligibility and benefit levels for new FSP applicants (i.e. front-end verification), and
- o verification of income, continued eligibility and benefit levels for active FSP recipients (i.e. on-going verification).

Type of  
Access

The type of access, that is, the means by which a match is conducted, is either an on-line or batch process:<sup>3/</sup>

- o "on-line" matching occurs when information about a food stamp applicant or recipient is entered directly onto a computer terminal and information is received back immediately based on a match done instantly by the computer.
- o "batch" matching occurs when information on a list of recipients or cases (or the entire caseload) is entered onto a computer file (e.g., tape or disk), that file is then matched to another file, and the results of the match are received either on a new file (e.g. tape or disk) or on a hard copy computer print-out. It takes longer to receive information from batch processing than from on-line processing (e.g., it can range from a few hours to several weeks).

Examination of Table II.1 reveals that 34 (14%) of the 248 systems are used for front-end matching, 107 (43%) are used exclusively for on-going matching, and 105 (42%) are used for both front-end and on-going matching. Table II.1 also distinguishes between on-line and batch access for matching. Fifty-three systems (21%) use on-line processing and 194 (78%) of the systems use batch processing.

---

<sup>3/</sup> Some state matching systems have both on-line and batch access, but for purposes of this study, they were defined as two separate matching systems, because different procedures must be followed to initiate each type of match.

Table II.1

Number of Computer Matching Systems  
in the Food Stamp Program,  
by Purpose of Match  
and Type of Access

Purpose	On-line Access	Batch Access	Total
Front-end verification only	17	17	34
On-going verification	5	102	107
Both front-end and on-going verification	31	74	105
Missing	—	2*	—
Total	53	193	248

\*Some descriptive information on two systems is missing



### C. COVERAGE OF THE RELEVANT ISSUES BY THE COMPUTER MATCH SYSTEMS

The operational characteristics of computer matching systems--the timing of the matches, the use of the match systems by other public assistance programs, and the maturity of systems--are all relevant topics for the study of computer matching in the FSP. The timing of the match, or when the information from the applicant or recipient is subjected to the match, can affect an agency's ability to monitor the changes in earned and unearned income levels for applicants and recipients and to issue correct benefit amounts. The extent to which a matching system is used by other public assistance programs within an agency has cost implications since matching costs may be shared among programs using the same system. The maturity of the systems provides insight into implementation trends in computer matching.

The timing of the match is related to both the purpose of the match and the type of access (on-line or batch) utilized by the matching system.

#### Timing of Front-end Matching

For front-end matching, timing is important because the intent of front-end matching is to verify the income and assets of the applicant household in order to determine the correct benefit level at the beginning of the household's participation in food stamps. All food stamp applicants must be certified or denied certification within 30 days and certain applicants must be certified earlier through expedited certification. Therefore, the sooner the front-end match is performed the more likely the FSA is to authorize the correct amount of benefits to the household.<sup>4/</sup>

Table II.2 summarizes the timing of the front-end matching systems by type of access. Of the 48 on-line matching systems used for front-end matching, 39 of them (81%) are performed immediately at application or daily. Another one is performed weekly, while four are performed at another time, such as before certification. Thus, nearly all the on-line front-end matching is conducted on the day of application.

---

<sup>4/</sup>Technically, front-end matching means that the match is performed before the food stamp household is initially certified, although it could be performed after certification if the household is eligible for expedited services.

Table II.2

Timing of Front-End Matching Performed  
in the Food Stamp Program,  
by Type of Access

Timing of Matching	Access		Total
	On-line Access	Batch Access	
Immediately	21	--	21
Daily	18	12	30
Weekly	1	13	14
Monthly	2	45	47
Quarterly	--	8	8
Other	4	4	8
Missing	2*	9*	11*
Total	<u>48</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>139</u>

\*Some descriptive information on eleven systems is missing. The two missing systems identified in Table II.1 are not included in either Table II.2 or II.3.

Of the batch matches that are used for front-end matching, the majority of them, 45 (50%) are performed monthly. A few are used more frequently: 12 are used daily and 13 weekly. Because of the 30-day certification period, it is highly unlikely that the eight quarterly matching systems used for front-end matching are used exclusively for front-end matching. This would not allow enough time to perform the match before certifications.

Timing of  
On-going  
Matching

A recipient's income or assets are likely to change over time and on-going matching is primarily used to verify changes in wages, income, assets and household composition, on a regular, on-going basis. Table II.3 summarizes the timing of the on-going matching systems by the type of access. Batch matching is best suited for matching at routine intervals of time and the table shows that the majority of on-going batch matching systems are used monthly (79 of the 176 on-going systems or 45%) or quarterly (40 systems or 23%). Together the monthly and quarterly batch matching systems make up the majority of the on-going batch matching systems (68%). Batch matching systems are also utilized at recertification (21 systems), weekly (12 systems), and annually (12 systems).

Of the 36 on-line on-going matching systems, the majority (75%) are utilized at recertification or at the worker's option.

Use of the  
Matching  
Systems by  
Other  
Programs

Many computer matching systems are simultaneously used by several public assistance programs.<sup>5/</sup> That is, many of the matching systems in use in the food stamp program are part of comprehensive public assistance matching systems. A comprehensive, or integrated, system facilitates the matching of all public assistance cases within an agency (or some subset thereof, such as, food stamps and AFDC, or food stamps, AFDC and GA) against external data bases. The Census identified the extent to which the 248 matching systems identified in this report are also used by other programs.

Appendix Table A-4 documents this aspect of computer matching in the food stamp program. Of the 248 matching systems, only 24 systems are used by the FSP only. That is, 90% of all food

---

<sup>5/</sup>Public assistance programs include food stamps, AFDC, Medicaid, Child Support, General Assistance, state supplements to SSI and a few miscellaneous programs.

Table II.3

Timing of On-Going Matching  
in the Food Stamp Program,  
by Type of Access

Timing of Matching	Access		Total
	On-line Access	Batch Access	
Weekly	0	12	12
Semi-monthly	2	4	6
Monthly	5	79	84
Quarterly	0	40	40
Semi-annually	0	2	2
Annually	1	12	13
At Recertification	18	21	39
At Worker's Option	9	1	10
Other	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	36	176	212

stamp matching systems (224 systems) are utilized by at least one other program. Appendix Table A-4 also shows that of the 248 systems, 88% (220 systems) are also used by AFDC and 69% (173 systems) are used by Medicaid. It is also interesting to note that 64, or 26% are used jointly by food stamps, AFDC and Medicaid.

#### Maturity of the Matching Systems

Technological advancements in the past decade have been extremely rapid. Computers are increasingly used for various management purposes in all public programs. Interfacing multiple data bases is now fairly easy to do and matching information across data bases has become quite common. Some state welfare agencies have been conducting computer matching since the early 1970's but the greatest proliferation has occurred in the early 1980's.

The census attempted to document the maturity of the matching systems used in the FSP, in terms of how long each system has been in use. Appendix Table A-3 shows the year each system was first used by the FSP, and this information is summarized in Table II.4.

It is clear, however, that the introduction of computer matching has greatly increased in the 1980's and each year since between 1980 and 1985 a greater number of systems have become operational. This trend will probably continue for at least another few years because of the new IEVS regulations that require FSP, AFDC, Medicaid and Unemployment Insurance programs to verify wages, Social Security income and other benefits of all program participants.

#### D. THE DATA SOURCES USED FOR COMPUTER MATCHING

This section describes one of the most important features of the data matching systems: data sources used for matching and the currency of those data. It also includes the time it takes to obtain the data, or to obtain the results of a match; and the time required for local offices to receive the results of the match. Finally, it discusses the nature of the match information received by the local offices.

#### The Data Source

Through the census, 25 data sources used for matching with food stamp files were identified. Table II.5 summarizes the number of matching systems using each type of data, and Appendix Table A-2 documents the data sources used by each of the 248

Table II.4

Number of Food Stamp Matching Systems  
by Year of Introduction  
of Routine Matching

(Year(s))	Introduction of Routine Matching Systems in the Food Stamp Program
1969	1
1971-75	21
1975-78	20
1979	20
1980	4
1981	16
1982	18
1983	29
1984	41
1985	43
1986	27
Missing	<u>8*</u>
Total	248

\*Descriptive information on 8 of the systems is missing.

Table II.5

Number and Percentage of  
Matching Systems  
Using Various  
Data Sources

Data Base	Number of Systems Accessing Each Data Base	Percent of Systems Accessing Each Base
Employer Reported		
Wages	72	29.0
UI Benefits	77	31.0
SSA Wage	8	3.2
SSA Employment	6	2.4
SSA Benefits	38	15.3
SSI Benefits	41	16.5
State Tax	2	0.8
Bank	4	1.6
DMV	9	3.6
AFDC	21	8.4
General Assistance	5	2.0
Medicaid	9	3.6
Medicare	5	2.0
1099 Tax	1	0.4
Other Juris. Wage	4	1.6
Other Juris. UI	4	1.6
Other Juris. PA	7	2.8
SSA/SSN	7	2.8
Federal Disqual.	10	4.0
Workers Comp.	5	2.0
Other Employment	3	1.2
Other Non-Welfare	20	8.0
FS Duplication	12	4.8
Other State Assistance	19	7.6
Other Federal	2	0.8

systems. (Table III.2 in Chapter III summarizes the number of states using each source of information.) The following list provides a brief explanation of each of the data sources.

- o **STATE WAGES FILES:** Most states have a wage reporting system which requires employers to report on a quarterly basis the amount of wages paid to each employee in jobs covered by Unemployment Insurance. All states will attempt a wage reporting system by 1987. The wage records are usually maintained by the state employment security agency, and in a few states the revenue or tax agency maintains similar wage records on individuals.
- o **UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FILES:** The state employment security agencies also administer the UI system. Each employment security agency keeps records of who receives unemployment insurance and the amount of the payments issued.
- o **SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION WAGE FILES:** Unlike the UI wage and benefits data which are handled at the state level, Social Security information comes from federally administered data systems. Wage or earnings files are created from the main Social Security Administration (SSA) data files on individuals.
- o **SSA SELF-EMPLOYMENT FILES:** These files, like the SSA wage files are created from SSA's data files on individuals who report self-employment.
- o **SSA BENEFIT FILES:** SSA benefit files are composed of Title II, or Old Age, Survivors, Disability and Hospital Insurance (OASDHI) benefits which include: retirement, survivor, and disability benefits, as well as eligibility for Medicare Parts A and B. Matching on this data base is referred to as the Beneficiary Data Exchange, or BENDEX. For purposes of this report the first three categories, which consist of dollar amounts, are referred to as SSA Benefit files. The last file, Medicare eligibility status, is referred to as a separate data source.
- o **SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME BENEFIT FILES:** SSA also maintains the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) files which include all individuals who are entitled to SSI and the amount they are entitled to receive monthly. This data source is referred to as the State Data Exchange or SDX.



- o STATE TAX FILES: State tax files include all sources of income and/or interest income. This is analogous to the Internal Revenue Service's Form 1040 for income and Form 1099 for interest income.
- o BANK RECORD FILES: These files contain either the savings account or checking account balance individuals have in a bank on any given day.
- o DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE FILES: These files, maintained by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) in each state, contain the owner's name for the make, model, and year of every vehicle registered in the state. It also contains the vehicle's serial and license numbers.
- o AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC) FILES: AFDC is a federally-supported, state administered program created by Title IV-A of the Social Security Act for families in need. These state files contain the names and benefit amounts of all persons receiving benefits from the AFDC program.
- o GENERAL ASSISTANCE (GA) FILES: General Assistance is a generic term used to comprise all state and local programs of continuing or emergency income assistance. These programs are legislated, designed and funded at the state and local level. This assistance is available to individuals who are not eligible for federally-supported assistance programs like AFDC. Like the AFDC files, these state files contain the names and benefit amounts of all persons receiving benefits from the program.
- o MEDICAID FILES: These state files contain names of individuals participating in Medicaid, a federally supported medical program for the needy.
- o MEDICARE FILES: These federal files contain names of individuals eligible for Medicare Parts A and B, a federal medical program that accompanies social security benefits.
- o INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE (IRS) INTEREST INCOME FILES: These federal files contain the information on an individual's interest income, or 1099 Form.
- o OTHER JURISDICTION'S WAGE FILES: These files contain wage information from a state or territory other than the one initiating the match.

- o OTHER JURISDICTION'S UI FILES: These files contain UI information from a state or territory other than the one initiating the match.
- o OTHER JURISDICTION'S PA FILES: These files contain information on individuals receiving public assistance benefits in a state or territory other than the one initiating the match.
- o SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER (SSN) VALIDATION FILES: These files, maintained by SSA, contain the master file for SSNs and are used for assigning and validating social security numbers.
- o NATIONAL DISQUALIFICATION FILES: These files contain the names and SSNs of individuals that have been disqualified from the food stamp program nationwide.
- o WORKERS COMPENSATION FILES: These state files include names of individuals who have received workers compensation insurance benefits, and the amount received.
- o OTHER EMPLOYMENT FILES: These state files contain the information on individuals participating in employment programs in the state such as those under the Job Training Partnership Act or those employed by the state.
- o STATE NON-ASSISTANCE FILES: This is a miscellaneous category of state files. It includes vital statistics files, lottery files, and other state and local files.
- o FOOD STAMP FILES: These state files of all FS recipients are used to ensure that food stamp applicants and recipients do not participate in the program more than once either by receiving benefits through a second household or by applying in a second county.
- o STATE ASSISTANCE FILES OTHER THAN THOSE PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED: This is another miscellaneous category which contains state assistance files. It contains child support enforcement files, the state supplement to SSI and other assistance files.
- o FEDERAL FILES: These files contain federal employee or retirement information.

The most frequently accessed sources of data for computer matching in the FSP are wages and UI benefits, which were accessed by 77 (31%) and 72 (29%) of the computer matching systems respectively. The third and fourth most frequently accessed data sources are the SSA benefit files. Forty-one (41), or 17% of the systems access the SDX system (SSI benefits), while 38 or 15% of the systems access the Bendex system (Title II benefits).

The fifth most frequently accessed data source is AFDC benefits, used by 21 matching systems (8%). The census instrument identified all of the matching systems that matched against non-FSP data bases. Food Stamp and AFDC client files in most other states are routinely checked as part of intake, often using an automated integrated management information system, but this is not considered a match by state officials. Therefore, the census may not have identified all "internal" verification systems. For example, the Texas welfare management information system automatically reconciles benefits for all public assistance recipients and Texas state officials do not consider this a matching system.<sup>6/</sup>

The sixth and seventh most often matched categories of data are state non-welfare files and state assistance files other than those previously identified. None of the data sources in these miscellaneous categories are accessed by more than five of the food stamp matching systems.<sup>7/</sup>

Currency of  
Information  
in Data  
Bases

In order for the information on the data bases to be most useful to the FSP, it should pertain to the same time period used for determining the benefit level. Respondents were asked to identify (1) how often each data source is updated and (2) how much time elapses between the end of the time period covered by the data and the time the data become available for matching. Although these may appear to be straightforward issues, they are in fact quite complex. In many states the two primary data bases used for matching--wage records and UI records--are

---

<sup>6/</sup> Other public assistance program files may be reconciled with food stamp files through a management information system as well.

<sup>7/</sup> There are five (5) vital statistics data bases accessed by FSP computer matching systems.

actually updated continuously. For example, employers are required to report quarterly earnings and, depending on the state, must submit the reports no later than three months after the reporting quarter has ended. In several states the data file becomes available one month after the end of the quarter, and is continuously or periodically (e.g. weekly, monthly) updated to include employers who submit reports after that time. In some states the FSA receives all updated files; in other states the data file is not made available until after all employer reports are entered, and the file is technically updated only once per quarter. Thus, wage records always cover one quarter, each individual's record is updated for each quarter, but the data base may be updated more frequently. The most current wage data could easily be for a quarter that ended six to nine months earlier. This same type of complexity exists with UI data.

Although most respondents knew how often they received files, only a few knew how often the wage, UI and SSA information was updated. Because of the complexity of this issue, the data are somewhat unclear. Therefore, currency and frequency of information by system is not presented in this report. These factors will be examined in detail during the intensive third phase of this study.

Time  
Required to  
Obtain  
the Results  
of the Match

Information on two aspects of how much time is required to perform the entire matching process is presented in Appendix Table A-7 and summarized here. Appendix Table A-7 identifies, system, how long it takes for the match to be performed from the perspective of the food stamp agency. The results may be obtained immediately, as in the case of on-line access which is initiated by the local agency. The results may be obtained overnight, if the state FSP initiates a match through a batch process. If the state food stamp agency is the initiator of the match, but the match must be performed in another agency or department, the length of time for the results of the match to come back from that agency or department may take up to a month or more.

Table II.6 summarizes the length of time required to perform the match on the 248 systems. The table shows that the most common time lapse (76 systems) is overnight. This type of match is usually handled at the state level. The results of 63 of the matches took from one to four weeks to "turn around" and another 11 took a month or more. This type of match is usually handled by an agency or department other than the food stamp agency.

Table II.6

Length of Time Required to Perform the Match  
by the Number of Food Stamp  
Matching Systems

Timing of Match	Number of Systems	Percent
Immediately	53	21.4
Later in Day	9	3.6
Overnight	76	30.7
2-6 days	31	12.5
1-4 weeks	63	25.0
1 Month or More	11	4.4
Varies	2	.8
Missing	<u>4*</u>	<u>1.6</u>
TOTAL	248	100

\*Descriptive information on 4 of the systems is missing.

Time  
Required  
for Local  
Offices to  
Receive the  
Results of  
the Match

Another potential time lag may occur between the time the state receives the information and when the local agency receives the information that has resulted from the match. As summarized in Table II.7, the results of front-end matching arrive at the local offices in less than one day for 68 (49%) of the 138 systems; and in two to six days for 59 (43%) of the systems. Appendix Table A-7 also includes this type of time lag for each system. For on-going matching, information for a majority of the systems (115 systems, 55%) arrives at the local offices in 2 to 7 days, and in less than one day for 63 (30%) of the systems.

Thus, nearly all systems provide local offices with matching information within one week of the initiation of the match: 92% of front-end system and 85% of on-going systems.

Nature of  
Information  
Received

An additional feature of a matching system is the nature of information that local FS employees receive about the results of the match, and there is tremendous variation across systems. The local offices might receive the following types of information on cases subjected to a match:

- o All information from the data sources on all cases checked.
- o Information from the data source only for those cases where some discrepant information was identified.
- o Information from the data source only for those cases with some minimum amount of income (frequently called a tolerance or threshold) identified.
- o Information only on those cases where some specified amount of discrepancy was identified, that is, a predetermined difference between the income the food stamp recipient reports and that which the matching system reports.

The first type of information provides local staff with extensive data on all cases, and could require substantial time at the local level to screen/identify the information that is important to verify.

The second type of information provides data on any discrepant information identified by the matching system on such items as income, address, SSN or program status. This method requires less screening on the part of local staff, although some discrepant cases may not require further action. For example,

Table II.7

Length of Time Required for Results of Food Stamp  
Matching to Reach Local Offices,  
by Number of Matching Systems

Time Lapse for Local Receipt of Match Information	Front-End		On-Going	
	Number of Systems	Percent	Number of Systems	Percent
Less Than One-Day	60	43.2	49	23.1
Overnight	8	5.8	14	6.6
2-6 Days	58	41.7	115	54.2
1-3 Weeks	10	7.2	28	13.2
1-4 Months	1	.7	3	1.4
Missing	<u>2*</u>	<u>1.4</u>	<u>3*</u>	<u>1.4</u>
Total	139	100	212	100

\*Descriptive information on 5 systems is missing.

the matching source might report an address that conflicts with the address the recipient reported, but if the local agency knows the recipient has moved, this requires no further action.

The third type of information, a tolerance or threshold, screens out those cases with discrepant information that are unlikely to require further action by local workers. For instance, a state may screen out those cases in which a recipient received \$500 or less income in a given quarter, because such small amounts of income are not likely to change the benefits a household is entitled to or its eligibility status.

The final type of information, based on discrepancy levels, also screens out discrepant information which is unlikely to require further action. A discrepancy level is different from a threshold in that it relates the information provided by the food stamp recipient to the information in the match system. For example, if the state has set a discrepancy level of \$300 income for a quarter, information from the results of a match is forwarded to the local office only if the income identified is at least \$300 different than the amount that is on the FS file based on recipient reported information.

Respondents were asked to describe in general what information local offices receive from each matching system, but because the intent of the questions was to obtain a better understanding of the various forms of information retrieval, it cannot be summarized by system. This issue will be addressed further in Phases 2 and 3 of the study.

This chapter summarized the characteristics of the 248 computer matching systems currently in use in the food stamp program nationwide. The next chapter describes the use of these systems by state.





### III. STATE ROLES AND POLICIES ON COMPUTER MATCHING

#### A. INTRODUCTION

To completely understand computer matching in the food stamp program, it is useful to examine the topic from both a system and a state perspective. While the previous chapter examined system features, this chapter examines computer matching using a state (as opposed to system level) focus. This level of analysis provides insight into the role of the states in the matching process, and enables one to view states in terms of their various approaches to computer matching.

Section B provides general information including the distribution of systems among states, the extent that a state's entire caseload is matched, and a general discussion of the data bases used by states. Section C details the interaction of state and local food stamp offices in the matching process, and section D discusses special matching activities that have been undertaken by state FSA's. The final section summarizes state respondents' perceptions about the effectiveness of computer matching and their general impressions about the new IEVS requirements.

#### B. GENERAL FEATURES OF STATE COMPUTER MATCHING POLICIES

##### Distribution of Matching Systems

Chapter II described the 248 computer matching systems identified nationwide. As of August 1986, only one state, Ohio, reported that it did not conduct any computer matching on a routine basis for food stamp applicants or recipients.<sup>1/</sup> All other states plus the District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands did conduct computer matching for food stamp applicants and/or recipients. Table I.1 in Chapter I summarized the different computer matching systems in operation in each state. Table III.1 here and Table A-1 in the Appendix show the distribution of these 248 systems among the states and jurisdictions. The number of systems range from one (in Nevada, Virginia and the Virgin Islands) to eleven (in Missouri), with most states having four or five different computer matching systems.

##### Coverage of FSP Caseload

States typically do some type of matching on their entire food stamp caseload using both front-end and on-going procedures. Nearly all states (48) use front-end matching (see Table A-15 in the Appendix). The five state/jurisdictions that reported doing no front-end matching in 1986 are Iowa,

---

<sup>1/</sup>Ohio does conduct computer matching for AFDC and those food stamp recipients who also receive AFDC are subject to matching. At the time of the survey, Ohio was planning to implement computing matching in the FSP in 1987 in accordance with IEVS.

Table III.1

Distribution of Computer Matching Systems  
Used in State  
Food Stamp Programs, 1986

Number of Matching Systems Used by State FS Programs	Number of States/ Jurisdictions	Percent
No computer matching for FSP	1	1.9
One matching system for FSP	3	5.7
Two matching systems for FSP	3	5.7
Three matching systems for FSP	6	11.3
Four matching systems for FSP	13	24.5
Five matching systems for FSP	14	26.4
Six matching systems for FSP	3	5.7
Seven matching systems for FSP	3	5.7
Eight matching systems for FSP	5	9.4
Nine or more matching systems for FSP	<u>2</u>	<u>3.8</u>
Total	53	100

North Dakota, Ohio, Washington, and the Virgin Islands. All of the other 48 states and territories have at least one system which matches their entire new applicant caseload (see Appendix Table A-16).

All states and jurisdictions except Ohio routinely conducted computer matching on active food stamp cases in 1986 (on-going matching). Of these states, only two (Alabama and Minnesota) did not have a system which matched their entire on-going caseload (see Table A-17 in the Appendix). Alabama conducts on-going matching only for clients receiving unemployment insurance or those considered "potential" unemployment insurance beneficiaries (e.g., those with strong work histories). Minnesota does not conduct on-going matches for children in FSP cases, restricting its matching to adults. (The census did not specifically ask whether a state matches on all clients or only adults, so it is possible that Minnesota's policy of only matching adults is more common. The survey of local FSAs in Phase 2 of the program operations study includes specific questions about matching on adults versus children, and that information can be used to supplement the state information reported in this document)

Though other states may restrict their matching to adults, the overall coverage of states' FSP caseload appears to be extensive in that nearly all cases were covered by some matching system.

Data Sources  
for Routine  
State  
Computer  
Matching

A variety of data sources are used by states in the course of their routine computer matching activities. Wages and unemployment insurance are the major types of information on food stamp clients that are verified. Consequently, the various state wage reporting agencies are the largest sources of data to the food stamp agencies. The Social Security Administration, by providing SSA wages and benefits as well as supplemental payments made to the aged, blind and disabled (SSI benefits) is an additional source of wage and income data. Banks and state motor vehicle departments are utilized by FSA's because they are sources of asset information.

Sources of data routinely matched by state agencies are summarized in Table III.2 and presented in more detail in Appendix Tables A-2 and A-14. Table III.2 corresponds to Table II.5 which summarized the data sources by matching system. The two most prevalent sources are unemployment insurance files and employer wage reports. Forty-eight states (91% of all states/jurisdictions) match against UI files and 45 states (85%) match wage records. The next most common data bases are SSA files on individuals receiving SSI benefits (34 states, 64% of

Table III.2

Number and Percentage of  
States Using Data Bases  
for Computer Matching in  
the Food Stamp Program

Data Bases	Number of States	Percent States
UI Benefits	48	90.6
DES Wages	45	84.9
SSI Benefits	34	64.2
SSA Benefits	32	60.4
AFDC	14	26.4
Other Non-Welfare	12	22.6
Other State Assist.	12	22.6
FS Duplication	10	18.9
DMV	9	17.0
SSA Wage	8	15.1
Federal Disqual.	8	15.1
Medicaid	7	13.2
SSA/SSN	7	13.2
SSA Employment	6	11.3
Other Juris. PA	6	11.3
Workers Comp.	5	9.4
Bank	4	7.5
General Assistance	4	7.5
Medicare	4	7.5
Other Juris. Wage	3	5.7
Other Juris. UI	3	5.7
State Tax	2	3.8
Other Employment	2	3.8
Other Federal	2	3.8
1099 Tax	1	1.9

all states) and individuals receiving Social Security retirement or survivor benefits (32 states, 60% of all states).

A significant number of states also conduct routine matching against other files in the welfare agency. In 14 states (26% of all states), the food stamp files are routinely matched against AFDC files, 4 states (8%) match against general assistance files, and 7 states (13%) match against Medicaid. Ten states (19%) reported that one of the routine matches checks for an individual's duplicate participation in food stamps. In many other states AFDC and FS records are routinely checked as part of the regular certification process, especially if the client management information systems for food stamps, AFDC, Medicaid and GA are integrated. Agencies with integrated management systems where routine verification is done as part of the intake process, however, were not identified as computer matching systems for the purposes of this study.

The primary data sources used by states are summarized below.

Wage Information. Wage data are accessed by FSA's through a variety of sources. As Table III.3 shows, the most common source of wage information is the state's own wage-reporting agency or, in the case of several states, the state Department of Revenue or Tax Board. Forty-five states access wage records from either an employer wage reporting system or an equivalent file through the state tax system. Eight states/jurisdictions compare client reported wages against wages reported to the Social Security Administration (SSA wages). Three jurisdictions (D.C., Missouri and Utah) examine wage records from both sources (i.e., using both wages reported by employers to the state wage reporting agency as well as wages reported to SSA). Three states (Nebraska, Ohio, and Rhode Island) reported no computer matching on wages from any source in 1986.

Unemployment Insurance Files. Unemployment Insurance files are used for matching in 48 states and jurisdictions. These files can provide not only information on current benefit amounts, but also a record of the benefits paid for up to five previous quarters. Some state wage files identify employers and note how much money is left in the beneficiary's UI account.

Social Security Administration Data. The Social Security Administration is a primary source of information to states. States use three types of SSA data for matching: (1) Nine states match against SSA Wages - wages on which social security taxes were paid (either through an employer or by self-employed individuals); (2) thirty-two states match SSA Benefits -

Table III.3

States' Use of Wage Information  
by Source of Data

Source	Number of States	Jurisdiction Percent
Only State Wage Reporting Agency	42	79.2
Only Social Security Administration	5	9.4
Both SSA and State reported wages	3	5.7
No wage matching from either source	<u>3</u>	<u>5.7</u>
Total	53	100

individual social security retirement or survivor benefits; and (3) thirty-four states match SSI Benefits - individual Supplemental Security Income benefits. Table III.4 shows the number of states with access to each of these three types of information, and Appendix Table A-14 provides specific detail.

Bank Matches. Financial institution (bank) matching is conducted on a routine basis by four states: Connecticut, Hawaii, Maine and Massachusetts. This generally consists of the welfare agency arranging for periodic matching with banks. The agency submits a list of social security numbers to the banks participating in the match, then the banks provide information on those with accounts on the day the match is conducted. The banks, for example, provide the balance in the account on that day. States do not have direct access to bank files.

Department of Motor Vehicles. Department of Motor Vehicles files are matched routinely by nine jurisdictions (Arizona, D.C., Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, New York, North Carolina and Utah). These files generally include motor vehicles registered to an individual, and in some cases the value of the vehicle.

### C. STATE AND LOCAL ROLES IN COMPUTER MATCHING

The process of computer matching involves activities at both the state and local levels. The census represents an initial attempt to examine the roles of the different levels, as summarized in this section. The second phase of the study will focus on local procedures and activities involved in matching and will discuss the role of computer matching in certification, recertification, fraud detection and the establishment of claims, activities which more naturally fall under the jurisdiction of the local office. In order to have a broad understanding of computer matching as it is used in the food stamp program, it is useful to examine the distribution and coordination of responsibilities between the state and local offices. Three specific types of activities were addressed in the census: (1) state and local interaction for conducting a match, (2) case actions taken as a result of a match, and (3) requirements states establish for local office reporting on the outcomes of matching.

#### State and Local Interaction During Matching Process

The computer matching process begins when an individual applies for food stamps, or when a food stamp recipient is subject to periodic recertification.



Table III.4

Number of States Using  
Social Security Administration Files  
For Computer Matching  
in the Food Stamp Program

SSA Data	Number of States/ Jurisdictions	Percent
SSA Wages	8	15.1
SSA Benefits	32	60.4
SSI Benefits	34	64.2

The actual initiation of a match (i.e., action that triggers a match) can occur at either the local level or the state level. The local office may have direct access to the data base, allowing local staff to conduct the match (in 102 of the 248 systems - 42% - local offices have this direct access). More often, the local agency must either request that the state conduct a match or a state office routinely initiates matches. Regardless of whether the local agency or state office accesses the data base, the information is usually obtained in one of two ways.

First, in most cases, a list of clients is sent to the agency maintaining the data base (either the state welfare/FSA agency or an outside agency). Within the census this is called batch access, and all states (except Ohio) have at least one batch matching system. As discussed in Chapter II, batch matching is generally used for on-going verification of active food stamp cases, on a weekly, monthly, quarterly, or annual basis, or at recertification. With batch matching, the agency performs the match and the information is received after some time delay ranging from a few hours to more than a month after the request is first made.

Alternatively, the state or local office may be equipped with computers that have direct access to files maintained for matching, and be able to retrieve the information immediately (called on-line access). On-line access is generally used for initial certification or investigative purposes. In 1986, twenty-six states had local on-line access for at least one computer matching system.

Regardless of the type of access, once the local office has received the data, local staff then are responsible for processing cases with discrepant information.

Case  
Activity as  
a Result of  
the Matching

There is considerable local variation in terms of action taken as a result of matching. First, all discrepant information must be reconciled. Clients may be contacted by phone or asked to come into the office to clarify the discrepancy. If necessary, a third party might be contacted (usually an employer). In many cases, the caseworker can clarify the inconsistency without any contact with the client or other persons. (Specific local reconciliation methods will be examined in phase 3 of this study).

Should attempts to reconcile the two sources of information fail, and a true over-issuance is identified as a result of computer matching, it is then the responsibility of the local

office to initiate a claim on that case to recapture past overpayments. As described in the Claims Collection Systems' report for the FSPOS, computer matching of wages is a major factor involved in the detection of over-issuances. When asked to rank the relative effectiveness of the various methods of identifying over-issuances (included among the several possibilities were Quality Control reviews and recertification reviews), computer matching of wages was among the three most highly ranked methods in 36 of the 53 state agencies.<sup>2/</sup>

Reporting  
Information  
on Matching

There is much variation in terms of what local FSAs report to the state agency about computer matching. Twenty-two states and jurisdictions require local offices to submit some reports related to their matching activities; eleven require reports on some front-end matching systems; twenty-one require reports on some on-going matching systems.

Table III.5 summarizes the status of reporting that these states require. Four states (Kansas, New Jersey, Washington and Wyoming) require that a "turnaround document," or tear sheet attached to each matched case, be completed on each "hit". Wyoming uses turnaround documents for all three of its matching systems (all are batch); New Jersey uses them for both of the on-going batch systems, and Washington uses it for its batch wage matching. The turnaround documents are attached to cases matched by batch systems and sent from the state office to local offices; local staff then report resolutions back to the state. In Kansas, local staff complete the turn-around document for each case on which duplicate participation is identified through the on-line matching system.

Fourteen state agencies require local offices to submit regular aggregate reports on the resolution of "hits" from at least some of their matching systems. These reports generally are to include number of "hits", number reconciled, and number referred to the claims unit. Three states require locals to report the number of claim referrals that result from matching.

Three observations can be made regarding reporting data on computer matching activity. First, few states routinely maintain information on the number of hits or the resolution of hits. Table A-6 in the Appendix indicates that 23 states have some type of activity/outcome data on on-going matching.

---

<sup>2/</sup> Sharon K. Long, Final State Census Report: Claims Collection System, Mathematica Policy Research, 1986.

Table III.5

States Requiring Local Reports  
on Computer Matching Activity  
in the Food Stamp Program

Nature of Reporting	States Requiring Some Reporting on Front-end Matching	States Requiring Some Reporting on On-Going Matching
Turnaround Document on each match	KS (1 of 4 systems) WY (2 of 2 systems)	KS (1 of 6 systems) NJ (2 of 2 systems) WA (1 of 3 systems) WY (3 of 3 systems)
Aggregate Resolution of hits	FL (1 of 1 system) GA (1 of 2 systems) MN (3 of 3 systems) NM (1 of 1 system) NY (1 of 2 systems) RI (3 of 5 systems) GU (5 of 5 systems)	DE (2 of 2 systems) FL (3 of 3 systems) GA (1 of 3 systems) HI (3 of 3 systems) IA (1 of 4 systems) MI (2 of 4 systems) MN (3 of 3 systems) NM (3 of 3 systems) NY (1 of 3 systems) PA (1 of 3 systems) RI (3 of 5 systems) TX (1 of 3 systems) WA (2 of 3 systems) GU (4 of 4 systems)
Number of Claim Referrals and/or Amount		CA (2 of 3 systems) CT (1 of 5 systems) LA (2 of 6 systems)
Number of Duplicate Participation Attempts	NE (1 of 5 systems)	
Reporting Information Not Specified in Census	MI (1 of 1 system)	VI (1 of 1 system)
Total States/Jurisdictions	11	22

However, these reports cover only 46 of the 107 systems used for on-going matching. Only four states maintain any data on outcomes of front-end matching, covering five of the 35 systems used for front-end matching. States do not regularly produce such reports, but several respondents indicated they could provide the information with additional programming and analysis (which was not requested for this study). It is possible, however, that local offices maintain more summary data, and that will be addressed in phases 2 and 3 of this study.

Second, although 22 states require some reporting, very few states require local offices to submit information about matching from all systems. Four states with only batch matching do require reports on all matching from all systems (Florida, Minnesota, Wyoming and Guam). Five states require reports on all on-going matching (Delaware, Hawaii, New Jersey, New Mexico, and the Virgin Islands), and all of these except one in Delaware are batch systems. Only two states require reports from locals on all front-end matching: Michigan, from its daily on-line match with DMV files, and New Mexico, from its on-line system that includes wage, UI, SSA and welfare agency information.

Third, even in states that do maintain data on matching, several respondents noted that either the local reports were not consistently received, or that some information was not completely accurate. Since respondents were not asked about data accuracy and consistency, it is not known how serious a limitation this is. Phase 3 of the study will examine the entire matching process and reporting in more detail. See Appendix Tables A-12 and A-13 for detailed information by system and state regarding the frequency and content of reports.

#### D. SPECIAL MATCHES CONDUCTED BY STATES

In addition to the routine matching functions undertaken on a regular basis, some states use their data processing capabilities to perform one-time only or "special" matches. The two broad categories for this type of match are (1) state-directed test matches using in-state files from other programs or the various data files of a neighboring jurisdiction, and (2) matching against federally-generated data bases.

Thirty state agencies reported special matching using at least one type of special match, and 15 of those agencies had conducted more than one type of special match during the last two years. Twenty-three state agencies reported no special

matching activities in their state during the last two years. Table A-18 in the Appendix summarizes these results. Special matching is generally regarded enthusiastically by the state respondents because it provides an opportunity to develop and test potentially useful matches by analyzing the cost and results without fully implementing an entire system.

A description of each type of special match, and the number of states that reported conducting each type at least once over the past two years, is presented below. Table A-18 in the Appendix identifies specific states that have conducted each type of special match.

- o NEIGHBORING JURISDICTION MATCHES ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FILES: This type of matching involves state matching of the food stamp files against the FS, AFDC and/or other public assistance programs' files from a neighboring jurisdiction. (15 states)
- o NEIGHBORING JURISDICTION MATCHES ON EARNED INCOME: This type of matching involves state matching of the food stamp file against the wage or unemployment compensation files of a neighboring jurisdiction. (9 states)
- o ASSET MATCHES: This category includes matching information on food stamp clients against records from financial institutions, such as banks and credit bureaus and also includes the matching of motor vehicle and recreational vehicle (including boats) registration records. (8 states)
- o SSN VERIFICATION MATCHES: This category of matching includes any matches involving interface with the Social Security Administration in attempting to verify or validate the Social Security Numbers of food stamp applicants or recipients. (2 states)
- o FEDERAL FILE MATCHES: This category involves matching against federally-generated files including retired civil service employees, the INS-deported alien file or the federal food stamp disqualification file. (8 states)
- o FNS-REGIONAL MATCH: This category includes special requests from FNS to match the Food Stamp files against wages, benefits and/or food stamp files of states within a particular region. (5 states)

By far the most frequently mentioned type of special match was the match with the public assistance programs in neighboring

jurisdictions, used by fifteen states. Interstate welfare/FS matching often becomes routine after the state tries it on a special or demonstration basis. For example, Kansas and Missouri matched their entire welfare and FS files on a trial basis in 1984 and then the interstate match became routine in 1985.

In contrast, only nine states conducted special matches with the wage or unemployment compensation files of a neighboring jurisdiction. A state might only be interested in this type of match if a substantial number of residents cross state lines in order to work. Coordinating with neighboring wage agencies is probably more difficult than coordinating with neighboring welfare agencies. These might be two reasons why special matches with other welfare agencies are more common than those with other states' wage and UI agencies.

Special intra-state matches have been conducted in ten states. For example, Texas matched its food stamp files against several state agencies' files, including the Department of Health (for vital statistics) and the Department of Corrections (for incarcerated individuals). Illinois described a demonstration project in which their food stamp files were matched against various state records including vital statistics, school attendance, and active and retired state employees. Most of these types of special matches do not become part of the routine matching activities of the state but appear to serve more as periodic checks for fiscal accountability.

Eight states have conducted special asset matches with local institutions. Most of these have been with financial institutions and have examined the presence of bank accounts and balances in accounts. All states which included matching against assets such as vehicles (automobiles, boats, or recreational vehicles) are also included in this category in Table A-18 of the Appendix.

Eight states also mentioned performing special matching using some kind of federally-generated file. California and Texas performed a special match using the retired federal employees file, Oklahoma matched against a list of deported aliens, Pennsylvania performed a special match using files from the Immigration and Naturalization Service at the request of FNS, and Rhode Island conducted a Bendex wage match on a one-time only basis. Wyoming used the federal disqualified FS recipients file, and two states mentioned an experimental Social Security number validation match.

Perceptions  
of Effectiveness

The general comments about computer matching were almost uniformly positive and most respondents were anticipating the development of new, more efficient matching systems or networks in the future. Most felt the wage and UI matches were generally the most effective matches in terms of reducing the number of erroneous certifications. States with matching systems that include joint access to wage and UI data listed those systems as the most effective in reducing certifications and error rates. Overall the UI portion of the joint matching system or the separate UI match was generally considered to be the most useful since the UI files report current benefits. That is, the UI information reports income for the same period that is relevant for determining food stamp eligibility and benefit levels.

In fact, although wage and UI matching were the systems most frequently mentioned as being effective, several respondents expressed dissatisfaction with wage matching, especially for front-end matching, because the earnings files have at least a three-month time lag; and in some states the most recent earnings might be as old as one year. Thus, wage files, according to some respondents, may be used as indicators of possible employment, suggesting which recipients work status should be monitored most closely, but not for verifying income.

There were fewer comments about other data bases. A few respondents noted that the SSA wage and SSI (SDX) files are very useful in identifying unreported income, but at least as many other respondents complained that the SSA data are too old to be useful.

Reactions  
to IEVS

The new IEVS regulations could require major changes to existing state computer matching policies. Three aspects of the regulations that they feel are particularly burdensome:

(1) the requirement to match on employer wage-reporting data, IRS data and SSA wage data; (2) the requirement to conduct matching on all food stamp clients; and (3) the requirement that 100% of all "hits" be "followed up" within 30 days. Although respondents were not specifically asked about IEVS which will



matching, (2) the duplication of effort that is likely to occur by matching against IRS and SSA wages when most states already conduct wage matches using data from their own wage reporting agencies, and (3) the 30-day follow-up requirement.

The reporting requirements under IEVS evoked many direct and concise comments. Several respondents felt that it is unrealistic to expect a completed follow-up on "hits" within 30 days after receipt of the information, since as one mentioned, "each print-out contains tens of thousands of cases". This is presumably a concern in those states that do not use discrepancy or income criteria to pre-screen matched cases. Some respondents felt that administrative and paperwork costs associated with matching will increase, as well as coordination required with other agencies. For example, one respondent explained that his FSA will now be required to establish new coordination with three or more agencies.

Additionally, several respondents expressed concern that states may no longer have the discretion to set discrepancy levels and tolerances, and that FSAs would thus have little flexibility in establishing effective matching policies. A number of persons commented that they are already undertaking matches which they feel are most effective, and a few felt that the requirement to match on all clients was not cost-effective. Some states now conduct wage matching only for adults, for example, and feel the required match on clients of all ages is wasteful and inefficient.

A few respondents in states that do not currently conduct extensive matching were also concerned that the new regulations will require substantial investment of state funds for increasing their programming and data processing capabilities, and some felt there was not enough assistance being provided by the federal office for technical development of systems.

Although the comments about IEVS generally reflected concern about the increased effort required of states, a few respondents did have positive reactions. Several agencies mentioned that although the IRS data are not timely, matching on the IRS data base will at least provide some access to financial resources and unearned income that has not previously been available. Similarly, in states where wage matching is not currently done, respondents view IEVS as a positive catalyst that was needed to allow development of a wage matching system.

Although many concerns were raised about the requirement that follow-up be conducted (and completed) within 30 days and the associated tracking costs involved, there were no specific comments about the requirement that 100% of the "hits" be followed-up. It is possible that those states which currently have detailed procedures for follow-up already require all "hits" to be reconciled/followed-up (although few of these states have reporting systems that allow for determination of whether all the hits are actually followed-up). In contrast, in states that currently do not have formal policies on follow-up, the respondents to this census may not know if 100% is excessive or not, since local agencies have substantial discretion in defining a "hit". This issue will be more directly addressed after the second phase of the program operations study.

#### E. SUMMARY

In summary, there is much variation across states in their policies concerning computer matching, and within each state, there is variation by type of matching system. All states and jurisdictions except Ohio conducted some type of computer matching on food stamp applicants and/or recipients in mid-1986. Most states had four or five different matching systems. The most common sources of data for matching are unemployment insurance payments and employer-reported wages. All states (except Ohio) have at least one batch system for matching, and twenty-six states have at least one on-line system. It is clear that computer matching in the FSP is quite extensive, and that, given the new IEVS requirements, development of new systems is likely to continue over the next few years.



#### IV. STATE COMPUTER MATCHING TYPOLOGIES

The structured nature of the data collected in the census allows for the development of descriptive state typologies. Several of the characteristics of state policies and activities regarding computer matching in the food stamp program were isolated and used as the basis for comparison of computer matching operations across states. The mode of access which a local office uses in conducting the matches, the range of information covered by the data bases accessed, the level of involvement or intensity of state policy with regard to computer matching and the historical background of matching within a state agency form the basis for the comparative dimensions and the subsequent development of state typologies. The first section of this chapter defines the comparative dimensions and the second section discusses some general state comparisons that can be made using the typologies developed.

##### A. SPECIFICATION OF THE COMPARATIVE DIMENSIONS

The following four dimensions form the basis for development of the descriptive state typologies:

- o Mode of access
- o Range of data bases
- o Intensity of state policies
- o Maturity of matching operations

The first three dimensions were created by combining several independent characteristics identified by the census, the fourth is a single descriptive characteristic.

The first dimension on which states can be compared is based on the method with which local offices in a state access the data bases for regular matching purposes. Matching, as discussed previously, can be conducted through on-line or batch processing. The following categories define the "mode of access" dimension:

- o No routine matching on food stamp participants. (one state)
- o Batch matching only. (25 states)
- o Essentially all matching is done by batch processing, but local staff do have on-line access to at least one non-wage data file (e.g., DMV files, vital statistics files). (7 states)

- o Both batch and on-line matching are routinely done, and local staff have on-line access to major matching data bases, including wage information. (20 states)

The second dimension for state comparison "the range of data bases", involves the level and type of data base utilization by a state. This dimension reflects whether a state uses only the information from the most common data bases (i.e., wage records, unemployment insurance and/or the Social Security files), or whether those common data sources are supplemented with information from other external files such as DMV, Banks, or from the records of other states. The "data range" categories are as follows:

- o No data used routinely for matching food stamp participants. (one state)
- o Wage, UI and/or SSA data plus internal agency files such as AFDC or duplicate FS participation. (25 states)
- o Wage, UI and/or SSA data plus internal agency files plus other external files (e.g., vital statistics, DMV, Banks). (27 states)

The third dimensions "intensity of state policy", consists of eight categories which together define; (1) whether matching is specifically done for applicants (i.e., front-end matching), or solely for recipients (i.e., on-going matching); and (2) how frequently on-going matching is conducted. The eight "intensity" categories are:

- o No computer matching is routinely conducted on food stamp participants, but those participants who are also receiving AFDC are included in the regular AFDC matches. (one state)
- o No special front-end matching is conducted on food stamp applicants, but regular quarterly matching is conducted on the entire caseload. Thus, all participants are subject to a match at least quarterly. (one state)
- o No special front-end matching is conducted on food stamp applicants, but regular monthly matching is conducted that includes all cases. Thus, all participants are subject to a match at least monthly. (8 states)

- o All new food stamp applicants each week, month or quarter are subject to matching, and regular matching on the entire caseload is conducted quarterly or at recertification. (3 states)
- o All new food stamp applicants each week or each month are subject to matching, and regular matching on the entire caseload is conducted weekly or monthly. (10 states)
- o All new food stamp applicants are subject to matching either immediately at intake or within twenty-four hours, and regular quarterly matching is conducted on the entire caseload. (7 states)
- o All new food stamp applicants are subject to matching either immediately at intake or within twenty-four hours, and regular monthly matching is conducted on the entire caseload. (15 states)
- o All new food stamp applicants are subject to matching either immediately at intake or within twenty-four hours, and regular weekly matching is conducted on the entire caseload. (4 states)

The fourth factor and final dimension for comparing states, "the maturity of matching operations" is based on the length of time for which a state has been conducting computer matching on food stamp participants. The four "maturity" categories are:

- o Computer matching on food stamp participants conducted as early as 1978.
- o Computer matching on food stamp participants initiated between 1979 and 1983. (15 states)
- o Computer matching on food stamp participants initiated between 1984 and 1986. (26 states)
- o No regular matching on food stamp participants as of 1986. (one state)

#### B. CATEGORIZATION OF THE STATES

The four dimensions are by no means the only important characteristics of state computer matching policies, but they do represent several of the critical differences among states in their approaches toward computer matching. These

characteristics were examined more closely to determine whether there are any patterns or relationships among them that might allow states to be categorized, or grouped together, based on common approach to computer matching. Tables IV.1, IV.2, IV.3, and IV.4 characterize all states on each of the four dimensions defined above. Although there are no obvious patterns or relationships among these four dimensions, the categorizations do provide a way to group states together based on similar characteristics.

Two primary characteristics of computer matching are the frequency with which states conduct matching and the types of data bases accessed. These two dimensions were used to categorize states; and the two-dimensional typology is presented in Table IV.5. This typology suggests at least two ways that states might be grouped together for further examination of computer matching.<sup>1/</sup>

First, about half the states limit their matching to the primary sources of data (UI, wage, SSA and files internal to the welfare/food stamp agency), the other half also match against some other external data bases (e.g., department of motor vehicles, banks, tax agencies). Additionally, Table IV.5 indicates that 20 of the 26 states that use additional external files also conduct matching very frequent. Sixteen of these conduct monthly matching on the entire FS caseload, and four conduct weekly matching on the entire FS caseload. This may suggest that those state agencies that use many data bases and conduct matches on a relatively frequent basis are perhaps similar in other ways. For example, these policies may reflect a high priority on computer matching, although it is not clear whether using more data bases and conducting more frequent matches is more effective than using one or two data bases and conducting less frequent matches. This categorization of states, however, does allow identification of states that are more or less similar on these two dimensions, a categorization which could be a proxy for the priority given to computer matching.

---

<sup>1/</sup>Three other two-way typologies were examined; "intensity" by "maturity", "data base by maturity" and "mode by intensity". The typology described in the following paragraphs, however, exemplifies the kind of insights from this type of categorization.

Table IV.1

Categorization of States by  
Intensity of Computer Matching Policies  
As of 1986

State	No PS Matching	No FEM; Quarterly Ongoing	No FEM; Monthly Ongoing	Wkly/Mnthly FEM; Qtrly/ Recert Ongoing	Wkly/Mnthly FEM; Wkly/ Mnthly Ongoing	Immed. FEM; Quarterly Ongoing	Immed. FEM; Monthly Ongoing	Immed. FEM; Weekly Ongoing
Alabama					X			
Alaska								
Arizona							X	
Arkansas							X	
California				X				
Colorado						X		
Connecticut						X		
Delaware						X		
Dist. of Col.						X	X	
Florida						X		
Georgia							X	
Hawaii							X	
Idaho			X					
Illinois							X	
Indiana					X			
Iowa			X					
Kansas							X	
Kentucky								
Louisiana					X			
Maine								X
Maryland					X			
Massachusetts					X			
Michigan								X
Minnesota					X			
Mississippi					X			
Missouri								X
Montana							X	
Nebraska							X	
Nevada				X				
New Hampshire							X	
New Jersey						X		
New Mexico						X		
New York							X	
North Carolina						X		
North Dakota			X					
Ohio	X							
Oklahoma					X			
Oregon							X	
Pennsylvania								
Rhode Island			X					
South Carolina							X	
South Dakota					X			
Tennessee						X		
Texas							X	
Utah								X
Vermont					X			
Virginia				X				
Washington			X					
West Virginia			X					
Wisconsin							X	
Wyoming			X					
Guam			X					
Virgin Islands		X						
TOTAL	1	1	8	3	10	7	15	4
Missing: 4								



Table IV.2

Range of Data Bases Used for  
Computer Matching, by State

State	Wage/UI/SSA/ & Agency Data Only	Wage/UI/SSA/ Agency & Other Data	No FSP Matching
Alabama	X		
Alaska		X	
Arizona	X		
Arkansas	X		
California		X	
Colorado		X	
Connecticut		X	
Delaware	X		
Dist. of Col.		X	
Florida		X	
Georgia		X	
Hawaii		X	
Idaho		X	
Illinois		X	
Indiana	X		
Iowa		X	
Kansas		X	
Kentucky	X		
Louisiana	X		
Maine		X	
Maryland	X		
Massachusetts		X	
Michigan		X	
Minnesota	X		
Mississippi	X		
Missouri		X	
Montana		X	
Nebraska	X		
Nevada	X		
New Hampshire	X		
New Jersey	X		
New Mexico		X	
New York		X	
North Carolina		X	
North Dakota		X	
Ohio			X
Oklahoma	X		
Oregon		X	
Pennsylvania	X		
Rhode Island		X	
South Carolina	X		
South Dakota	X		
Tennessee	X		
Texas	X		
Utah		X	
Vermont	X		
Virginia	X		
Washington	X		
West Virginia		X	
Wisconsin	X		
Wyoming		X	
Guam		X	
Virgin Islands	X		
Total	25	27	1

Table IV.3

Mode of Access for  
Computer Matching Procedures  
By State

State	All Batch Matching	Mostly Batch/ On-line Access to Non-wage Data	Both Batch and On-line Including Wage Data	No Matching
Alabama			X	
Alaska	X			
Arizona			X	
Arkansas			X	
California	X			
Colorado			X	
Connecticut			X	
Delaware			X	
Dist. of Col.			X	
Florida	X			
Georgia		X		
Hawaii			X	
Idaho		X		
Illinois			X	
Indiana	X			
Iowa	X			
Kansas			X	
Kentucky			X	
Louisiana			X	
Maine		X		
Maryland	X			
Massachusetts	X			
Michigan		X		
Minnesota	X			
Mississippi	X			
Missouri			X	
Montana			X	
Nebraska		X		
Nevada	X			
New Hampshire	X			
New Jersey			X	
New Mexico	X			
New York		X		
North Carolina	X			
North Dakota	X			
Ohio				X
Oklahoma	X			
Oregon			X	
Pennsylvania	X			
Rhode Island	X			
South Carolina			X	
South Dakota	X			
Tennessee			X	
Texas	X			
Utah			X	
Vermont	X			
Virginia	X			
Washington	X			
West Virginia	X			
Wisconsin		X		
Wyoming	X			
Guam	X			
Virgin Islands	X			
Total	25	7	20	1

Table IV.4

Maturity of Computer Matching Operations  
By State

State	Earliest Year for Matching in FSP			
	Prior to 1979	1979- 1983	1984- 1986	No FSP Matching as of 1986
Alabama			X	
Alaska			X	
Arizona		X		
Arkansas		X		
California			X	
Colorado			X	
Connecticut			X	
Delaware			X	
Dist. of Col.		X		
Florida		X		
Georgia			X	
Hawaii			X	
Idaho		X		
Illinois	X			
Indiana			X	
Iowa		X		
Kansas	X			
Kentucky	X			
Louisiana		X		
Maine		X		
Maryland			X	
Massachusetts		X		
Michigan			X	
Minnesota			X	
Mississippi			X	
Missouri			X	
Montana			X	
Nebraska		X		
Nevada	X			
New Hampshire			X	
New Jersey		X		
New Mexico			X	
New York		X		
North Carolina			X	
North Dakota			X	
Ohio				X
Oklahoma			X	
Oregon	X			
Pennsylvania		X		
Rhode Island			X	
South Carolina	X			
South Dakota		X		
Tennessee			X	
Texas		X		
Utah	X			
Vermont			X	
Virginia	X			
Washington	X			
West Virginia			X	
Wisconsin	X			
Wyoming			X	
Guam			X	
Virgin Islands			X	
Total	10	15	27	1

Table IV.5

Categorization of States Based on  
Intensity of CM Policy and Range of  
Data Bases Used

Intensity	Range of Data Bases Used			Total
	No FS Matching	Wage/UI/SSA & Agency Data Only	Wage/UI/SSA/ Agency & Other Data	
No FS Matching	1			1
No FEM; Ongoing Match Quarterly		1		1
No FEM; Ongoing Match Monthly		1	7	8
Wkly or Mnthly FEM; Ongoing Match Qtrly or at Recert		3		3
Wkly or Mnthly FEM; Ongoing Match Wkly or Mnthly		9	1	10
Immed or Daily FEM; Ongoing Match Qtrly or at Recert		3	4	7
Immed or Daily FEM; Ongoing Match Mnthly		7	8	15
Immed or Daily FEM; Ongoing Match Wkly			4	4
Frequency not known	—	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
Total	1	26	26	53

Second, it is interesting to note that of the ten states that reported no front-end matching, seven (Iowa, Idaho, North Dakota, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Wyoming and Guam) conduct monthly matching of the entire caseload and use external files as well as wage, UI and SSA information. This may indicate that frequent on-going matching is conducted in lieu of actual front-end matching at application. Similarly, in 15 states, front-end matching is conducted either immediately at application or within 24 hours, and the entire FS caseload is subject to matching every month. The remaining states have less frequent on-going matching. These three groups of states might allow examination of (1) the marginal contribution of having both front-end matching and different frequencies of on-going matching, and (2) the operational tradeoffs between actual front-end matching (i.e., at application) and routine matching of the entire caseload each month.

The development of typologies provides a useful framework for distinguishing groups of states and thereby identifying predominant characteristics or trends in the use of computer matching nationwide. The simple two-dimensional typology described above allowed states to be grouped together in terms of the frequency of matching and the data bases accessed. Following similar procedure, the four comparative dimensions could be used to expand the analysis of computer matching in the FSP to include other typologies that may be of specific research, operational or policy interest.

**APPENDIX A**  
**SUMMARY TABLES OF COMPUTER MATCHING**  
**CENSUS RESULTS**



Appendix Table A-1

Names of Computer Matching Systems  
Routinely Used  
(as of August 1986)

Alabama

1. Dept. of Industrial Relations Batch
2. Dept. of Industrial Relations On-line

Alaska

1. Permanent Fund
2. Longevity Bonus
3. State Payroll
4. State Data Exchange
5. Beneficiary Data Exchange
6. Unemployment
7. Wage
8. Enumeration - Social Security Number

Arizona

1. Beneficiary Data Exchange Batch
2. Beneficiary Data Exchange On-line
3. Base Wage-Batch
4. Base Wage-On-line
5. Unemployment Insurance On-line
6. National Fraud Network
7. Department of Motor Vehicles

Arkansas

1. Employment Security Division (ESD) - recipients
2. ESD - applicants
3. ACES-annual
4. Child Support Enforcement - DEFRA refunds
5. AFDC Payment Increase
6. ESD/ACES On-line

California

1. Integrated Earnings
2. Disqualification File
3. Interest Income Match

Colorado

1. Wage Data Match
2. State Data Exchange
3. COIN-Client Oriented Info. Network
4. CUBS-Col. Unemp. Benefit System

Connecticut

1. Department of Labor on-line
2. Beneficiary Data Exchange - State Data Exchange On-line
3. Department of Labor Batch
4. Bank Batch Match
5. Beneficiary Data Exchange -State Data Exchange Batch

Delaware

1. Department of Labor - Batch
2. Department of Labor - On-line



Appendix Table A-1

Names of Computer Matching Systems  
Routinely Used  
(as of August 1986)

Dist. of Col.

1. D.C. Wage and Unemployment Insurance (UI)
2. Maryland Wage and UI
3. Maryland Public Assistance (PA)
4. Virginia Wage, UI & PA
5. Beneficiary Data Exchange, State Data Exchange, and Earnings
6. Terminal

Florida

1. Income Verification System
2. Duplicate Participation Match
3. FS/AFDC Match

Georgia

1. Labor
2. Beneficiary Data Exchange
3. State Data Exchange
4. On-line Vital Statistics

Hawaii

1. Wage-SSA
2. Bank
3. Quarterly Unemployment Insurance Benefits (UIB)
4. On-line UIB
5. Department of Motor Vehicles

Idaho

1. Numident - Social Security Number
2. Nationwide Disqualification
3. Beneficiary Data Exchange
4. State Data Exchange
5. Department of Labor (DOL) Quarterly Wage
6. Child Support Enforcement
7. Vital Statistics
8. DOL Monthly Unemployment Insurance Benefits

Illinois

1. Wage Batch
2. Unemployment Insurance Benefits (UIB) Batch
3. State Data Exchange
4. State Tax
5. Motor Vehicle
6. State Employees
7. Wage-On-line
8. UIB On-line
9. Duplicate Participation / Internal Client Data Base

Appendix Table A-1

Names of Computer Matching Systems  
Routinely Used  
(as of August 1986)

Indiana

1. Wage/Unemployment Insurance Quarterly
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits (UCB) Monthly
3. Wage/UCB Weekly
4. Social Security Number Verification
5. Beneficiary Data Exchange / State Data Exchange

Iowa

1. Earnings
2. Unemployment
3. Beneficiary Data Exchange
4. Illinois Public Assistance Match

Kansas

1. Batch Wage and Unemployment Compensation
2. Kansas Payroll
3. Wichita School Enrollment
4. Missouri Welfare
5. Kansas City Taxes
6. On-line Wage and Unemployment Compensation
7. Duplicate Participation
8. Beneficiary Data Exchange

Kentucky

1. State Data Exchange - batch
2. AFDC - batch
3. Unemployment Insurance - batch
4. Wage - batch
5. On-line access for four systems above

Louisiana

1. Department of Labor (DOL) - Wage - batch
2. DOL-Unemployment Compensation - batch
3. Welfare Information System (WIS) - batch
4. State Data Exchange - batch
5. Beneficiary Data Exchange - batch
6. On-line access for five systems above

Maine

1. Unemployment
2. Wage Quarterly
3. Wage Daily
4. Bank
5. State Data Exchange
6. Beneficiary Data Exchange
7. Department of Motor Vehicles

Appendix Table A-1

Names of Computer Matching Systems  
Routinely Used  
(as of August 1986)

Maryland

1. SWICA-State Wage Info.  
Collection
2. SUI-State Unemployment Ins.
3. Beneficiary Data Exchange

Massachusetts

1. Wages
2. Unemployment Insurance
3. Beneficiary Data Exchange
4. State Data Exchange
5. Banks

Michigan

1. Beneficiary Data Exchange
2. State Data Exchange
3. Motor Vehicle
4. BEER-Social Security Wage Record

Minnesota

1. Wage-Quarterly
2. Unemployment Compensation
3. Social Security Number
4. Duplicate Participation

Mississippi

1. Beneficiary Data Exchange
2. State Data Exchange
3. Wage/Unemployment Insurance (UI) Quarterly
4. UI Monthly
5. UI Weekly

Missouri

1. State Data Exchange
2. Beneficiary Data Exchange
3. Vital Statistics
4. Lottery
5. Employment Security Interface (ESI) - batch
6. ESI On-line
7. Department of Social Services
8. Kansas ES
9. Vital I-Births
10. Vital II-Deaths
11. National Disqualification System

Montana

1. Wage
2. Unemployment Compensation
3. Workers Compensation
4. Beneficiary Data Exchange

Appendix Table A-1

Names of Computer Matching Systems  
Routinely Used  
(as of August 1986)

Nebraska

1. State Data Exchange
2. Beneficiary Data Exchange
3. Unemployment Compensation
4. Welfare Client Exchange
5. Duplicate Participation

Nevada

1. Employment Security Department

New Hampshire

1. Wage
2. Unemployment Compensation
3. Beneficiary Data Exchange
4. State Ddata Exchange
5. Prescreen

New Jersey

1. Wage Batch
2. Unemployment Insurance Batch
3. Wage On-Line
4. Unemployment Insurance On-Line

New Mexico

1. Food Stamp Master File batch
2. Food Stamp Master File on-line
3. Arizona Quarterly
4. AFDC Update

New York

1. Comprehensive Income Tracking
2. RFI-Resource File Integration
3. Overnight Clearance System
4. Department of Motor Vehicles
5. Quick Turnaround System

North Carolina

1. Beneficiary Data Exchange / State Data Exchange
2. Employment Security Commission Batch
3. Department of Transportation
4. Employment Security Commission On-Line

North Dakota

1. Job Search - Wage
2. Job Search - Unemployment Insurance
3. Workers Compensation
4. Beneficiary Data Exchange / State Data Exchange

Ohio

NO COMPUTER MATCHING FOR FOOD STAMPS

Oklahoma

1. State Data Exchange - SSI Recipients
2. Beneficiary Data Exchange
3. Employment Security Commission - Unemployment Insurance Benefits
4. Employment Security Commission - Wages
5. Welfare Enumeration

Appendix Table A-1

Names of Computer Matching Systems  
Routinely Used  
(as of August 1986)

Oregon

1. Unemployment Commission Batch
2. Quarterly Wage Batch
3. Beneficiary Data Exchange / State Data Exchange
4. Workers Compensation
5. Child Support
6. Food Stamp Disqualification
7. Client Maintenance - Batch
8. Client Maintenance - On-Line

Pennsylvania

1. Quarterly Wage and Unemployment Compensation (UC)
2. Daily Wage and UC
3. Lottery

Rhode Island

1. Unemployment Compensation Benefits
2. Temporary Disability Insurance
3. New Hires
4. AFDC
5. Child Support Enforcement - Bureau of Family Support

South Carolina

1. Employment Security Commission (ESC) - batch
2. Client Info.- On-line
3. National Disqualification
4. ESC On-line
5. Natl. Disqualif.- On-line

South Dakota

1. Beneficiary Data Exchange
2. State Data Exchange
3. Department of Labor Wage

Tennessee

1. Clearinghouse - Batch
2. Clearinghouse - On-line

Texas

1. Beneficiary Data Exchange / State Data Exchange
2. Employment Commission (EC) - Weekly
3. EC-Monthly
4. EC-Quarterly
5. Duplicate Participation

Utah

1. Wage
2. Beneficiary Data Exchange
3. Immigration and Naturalization Service
4. Wage On-line
5. Unemployment Compensation (UC) On-line
6. Department of Motor Vehicles On-line
7. BEERS (Social Security Wage) Batch
8. Unemployment Compensation Batch

Appendix Table A-1

Names of Computer Matching Systems  
Routinely Used  
(as of August 1986)

Vermont

1. State Data Exchange
2. Beneficiary Data Exchange & SSA
3. Unemployment Compensation
4. Numident - Social Security Number

Virginia

1. Virginia Employment Commission

Washington

1. Unemployment Compensation
2. Wage Discrepancy
3. Disqualifications
4. State Data Exchange

West Virginia

1. Employment Security - Wages
2. Employment Security - Unemployment
3. Workers Comp.
4. Duplicate Participation

Wisconsin

1. Unemployment Compensation
2. Beneficiary Data Exchange
3. SSA Wages
4. State Data Exchange
5. Social Security Number Validation
6. Multiple Cases
7. Existing Case

Wyoming

1. Unearned Income
2. Wage
3. IRS

Guam

1. Duplicate Participation
2. Beneficiary Data Exchange
3. Wage Matching
4. Duplicate Partic. with Commonwealth Northern Mariana Islands
5. Disqualification

Virgin Islands

1. Virgin Islands Wage

Appendix Table A-2  
Major Computer Matching Systems  
By System and Data Sources Matched  
(Q4.00)

STATE	SYS TEM	WAGE	U2 BEN	SSA WAGE	SSA EMPL	SSA BEN	SSI BEN	ST. TAX	BANK	DMV	AFDC	GA	MEDI CAID	MEDI CARE	1099 TAX	OTH JUR. WAGE	OTH JUR. UI	OTH JUR. PA	SSA/ SSN	FED. DISQ	WORK COMP	OTH EMPL	OTH NON WELF	FS DUPL	OTH ST ASST	FED- ERAL
AL	1	X	X																							
	2	X	X																							
AK	1																									
	2																									
	3																									
	4						X																			
	5					X																				
	6		X																							
	7	X																								
	8																									
AZ	1					X													X							
	2					X																				
	3	X																								
	4	X																								
	5		X																							
	6																									
	7									X											X					
AR	1	X	X																							
	2	X	X																							
	3						X																			
	4																									
	5										X															
	6										X															
CA	1	X		X			X						X												X	X
	2	X																								
	3							X													X					
CO	1	X																								
	2						X																			
	3										X		X													
	4	X	X																							





Appendix Table A-2

Major Computer Matching Systems  
By System and Data Sources Matched  
(Q4.00)

STATE	SYS TEM	WAGE	UI BEN	SSA WAGE	SSA EMPL	SSA BEN	SSI BEN	ST. TAX	BANK	DMV	AFDC	GA	MEDI CAID	MEDI CARE	1099 TAX	OTH JUR. WAGE	OTH JUR. UI	OTH JUR. PA	SSA/ SSN	FED. DISQ	WORK COMP	OTH EMPL	OTH NON WELF	FS DUPL	OTH ST ASST	FED- ERAL
IL	1	X																								
	2			X																						
	3						X																			
	4							X																		
	5									X																
	6																						X			
	7	X																								
	8			X																						
	9																								X	
IN	1	X	X																							
	2		X																							
	3	X	X																							
	4																		X							
IA	5					X	X																			
	1	X																								
	2		X																							
	3					X																				
KS	4																	X								
	1	X	X																							
	2																							X		
	3																						X			
	4															X	X	X								
	5																						X			
	6	X	X																							
KY	7																							X		
	8					X																				
	1						X																			
	2													X												
	3			X																						
	4	X																								
	5	X	X				X							X												

Appendix Table A-2

Major Computer Matching Systems  
By System and Data Sources Matched  
(Q4-00)

STATE	SYS TEM	WAGE	UI BEN	SSA WAGE	SSA EMPL	SSA BEN	SSI BEN	ST. TAX	BANK	DMV	AFDC	GA	MEDI CAID	MEDI CARE	1099 TAX	OTH JUR. WAGE	OTH JUR. UI	OTH JUR. PA	SSA/ SSN	FED. DISQ	WORK COMP	OTH EMPL	OTH NGN WELF	FS DUPL	OTH ST ASST	FED- ERAL
LA	1	X																								
	2			X																						
	3										X	X	X													
	4						X																			
	5					X	X																			
ME	6	X	X			X	X				X	X	X													
	1		X																							
	2	X																								
	3	X	X																							
	4								X																	
MD	5						X																			
	6					X																				
	7									X																
	1	X	X																							
	2		X																							
MA	3					X																				
	1	X																								
	2		X																							
	3					X																				
	4						X																			
MI	5								X																	
	1					X								X												
	2						X																			
	3																									
	4			X	X																					
MN	1	X																								
	2		X																							
	3																									
	4																									
	5																									

**Major Computer Matching Systems  
By System and Data Sources Matched  
(Q4.00)**

	SYS		UI	SSA	SSA	SSA	SSI	ST.		MEDI	MEDI	1099	JUR.	JUR.	JUR.	SSA/	FED.	WORK	OTH	OTH	NON		FS	SY	FED-
--	-----	--	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	-----	-----	-----	--	----	----	------

MS	1				X	
	2					X
	3	X		X		

Appendix Table A-2

Major Computer Matching Systems  
By System and Data Sources Matched  
(Q4.00)

STATE	SYS TEM	WAGE	UI BEN	SSA WAGE	SSA EMPL	SSA BEN	SSI BEN	ST. TAX	BANK	DMV	AFDC	GA	MEDI CAID	MEDI CARE	1099 TAX	OTH JUR. WAGE	OTH JUR. UI	OTH JUR. PA	SSA/ SSN	FED. DISQ	WORK COMP	OTH EMPL	OTH NON WELF	FS DUPL	OTH ST ASST	FED- ERAL
NJ	1	X																								
	2			X																						
	3	X																								X
	4			X																						X
NM	1	X	X				X				X															X
	2	X	X				X				X														X	
	3																									X
NY	4										X							X								
	1			X		X																	X			
	2	X																								
	3	X	X																							
	4									X																
NC	5	X																								
	1					X	X																			
	2	X	X																							
	3									X																
	4	X	X																							
ND	1	X																								
	2			X																						
	3																									
	4					X	X															X				
OK	1						X																			
	2					X																				
	3			X																						
	4	X																								
OR	5																		X							
	1			X																						
	2	X																								
	3					X	X																			
	4																									
	5																									X
	6																									
	7										X	X													X	
8	X	X			X	X				X															X	

Appendix Table A-2

Major Computer Matching Systems  
By System and Data Sources Matched  
(Q4.00)

STATE	SYS TCM	WAGE	UI REV	SSA WAGE	SSA EMPL	SSA BEN	SSI BEN	ST. TAX	BANK	DMV	AFOC	GA	MEDI CAID	MEDI CARE	1099 TAX	OTH JUR. WAGE	OTH JUR. UI	OTH JUR. PA	SSA/ SSN	FED. DISQ	WORK COMP	OTH EMPL	OTH NON WELF	FS DUPL	OTH ST ASST	FED- ERAL
PA	1	X	X																							
	2	X	X																							
	3																									
RI	1		X																				X			
	2																									
	3																					X			X	
	4										X															
	5																								X	
SC	1	X	X																			X				
	2						X				X	X	X													
	3										X										X					
	4	X	X																		X					
	5																					X				
SD	1					X															X					
	2																									
	3	X	X				X																			
TN	1	X	X			X	X				X		X													X
	2	X	X			X	X				X		X													X
TX	1				X	X	X																			
	2	X	X																							
	3		X																							
	4	X																								
	5																									
UT	1	X																						X		
	2					X	X																			
	3																									
	4	X																								X
	5		X																							
	6																									
	7			X	X					X																
	8		X																							

Appendix Table A-2

Major Computer Matching Systems  
By System and Data Sources Matched  
(Q4.00)

STATE	SYS TEM	WAGE	UI BEN	SSA WAGE	SSA EMPL	SSA BEN	SSI BEN	ST. TAX	BANK	DMV	AFDC	GA	MEDI CAID	MEDI CARE	1099 TAX	OTH JUR. WAGE	OTH JUR. UI	OTH JUR. PA	SSA/ SSN	FED. DISQ	WORK COMP	OTH EMPL	OTH NON WELF	FS DUPL	OTH ST ASST	FED- ERAL
VT	1			X	X	X	X							X												
	2																									
	3		X																							
	4																		X							
VA	1	X	X																							
WA	1		X																							
	2	X																								
	3																							X		
	4						X																			
WV	1	X																								
	2		X																							
	3																				X					
	4										X		X											X		
WI	1		X				X																		X	
	2																									
	3			X																						
	4						X																		X	
	5																		X						X	
	6																								X	
	7																								X	
WY	1		X				X				X												X			X
	2	X																								
	3																									
GU	1														X									X		
	2					X																				
	3			X																						
	4																									
	5																	X								
VI	1	X																			X					
TOTAL		72	77	3	6	38	41	2	4	9	21	5	9	5	1	4	4	7	7	10	5	3	20	12	19	2

Appendix Table A-3

General Characteristics of Matching Systems  
Conducted by State Food Stamp Programs  
By State by System

State	System	State Coverage? (Q2.01)	Yr. Begun For FSP (Q2.05)	Type of Access (Q5.00)
ALABAMA	1	YES	1983	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	ON-LINE
ALASKA	1	YES	1983	BATCH
	2	YES	1983	BATCH
	3	YES	1983	BATCH
	4	YES	1983	BATCH
	5	YES	1983	BATCH
	6	YES	1983	BATCH
	7	YES	1983	BATCH
	8	YES	1986	BATCH
ARIZONA	1	YES	1985	BATCH
	2	YES	1984	ON-LINE
	3	YES	1982	BATCH
	4	YES	1983	ON-LINE
	5	YES	1983	ON-LINE
	6	YES	1986	BATCH
	7	YES	1979	ON-LINE
ARKANSAS	1	YES	1979	BATCH
	2	YES	1979	BATCH
	3	YES	1981	BATCH
	4	YES	1985	BATCH
	5	YES	1982	BATCH
	6	YES	1981	ON-LINE
CALIFORNIA	1	YES	1983	BATCH
	2	YES	D.K.	BATCH
	3	YES	1986	BATCH
COLORADO	1	YES	1983	BATCH
	2	YES	1981	ON-LINE
	3	YES	1983	ON-LINE
CONNECTICUT	4	YES	1984	ON-LINE
	1	YES	1984	ON-LINE
	2	YES	1984	ON-LINE
	3	YES	1984	BATCH
	4	YES	1985	BATCH
DELAWARE	5	YES	1986	BATCH
	1	YES	1983	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	ON-LINE
DIST. OF COL.	1	YES	1983	BATCH
	2	YES	1986	BATCH
	3	YES	1986	BATCH
	4	YES	1983	BATCH
	5	YES	1974	BATCH
	6	YES	1983	ON-LINE
FLORIDA	1	YES	1980	BATCH
	2	YES	1984	BATCH
	3	YES	1983	BATCH
GEORGIA	1	YES	1984	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	BATCH
	3	YES	1985	BATCH
	4	YES	1985	ON-LINE

Appendix Table A-3

General Characteristics of Matching Systems  
Conducted by State Food Stamp Programs  
By State by System

State	System	State Coverage? (Q2.01)	Yr. Begun For FSP (Q2.05)	Type of Access (Q5.00)
HAWAII	1	YES	1982	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	BATCH
	3	YES	1985	BATCH
	4	YES	1979	ON-LINE
	5	NO	1985	ON-LINE
IDAHO	1	YES	1983	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	BATCH
	3	YES	1975	BATCH
	4	YES	1975	BATCH
	5	YES	1981	BATCH
	6	YES	1985	ON-LINE
	7	YES	1986	ON-LINE
	8	YES	1981	BATCH
ILLINOIS	1	YES	1974	BATCH
	2	YES	1978	BATCH
	3	NO	D.K.	BATCH
	4	YES	1985	BATCH
	5	YES	1979	BATCH
	6	YES	1977	BATCH
	7	YES	1974	ON-LINE
	8	YES	1978	ON-LINE
	9	YES	1971	ON-LINE
INDIANA	1	YES	D.K.	BATCH
	2	YES	1986	BATCH
	3	YES	1986	BATCH
	4	YES	D.K.	BATCH
	5	YES	D.K.	BATCH
IOWA	1	YES	1976	BATCH
	2	YES	1976	BATCH
	3	YES	1984	BATCH
	4	YES	1982	BATCH
KANSAS	1	YES	1982	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	BATCH
	3	NO	1983	BATCH
	4	YES	1985	ON-LINE
	5	NO	1974	ON-LINE
	6	YES	1976	ON-LINE
	7	YES	1985	BATCH
	8	YES	1972	BATCH
KENTUCKY	1	YES	1975	BATCH
	2	YES	1975	BATCH
	3	YES	1975	BATCH
	4	YES	1975	BATCH
	5	YES	1975	ON-LINE
LOUISIANA	1	YES	1979	BATCH
	2	YES	1979	BATCH
	3	YES	1979	BATCH
	4	YES	1979	BATCH
	5	YES	1982	BATCH
	6	YES	1979	ON-LINE



Appendix Table A-3

General Characteristics of Matching Systems  
Conducted by State Food Stamp Programs  
By State by System

State	System	State Coverage? (Q2.01)	Yr. Begun For FSP (Q2.05)	Type of Access (Q5.00)
MAINE	1	YES	1977	BATCH
	2	YES	1982	BATCH
	3	YES	1983	BATCH
	4	YES	1984	BATCH
	5	YES	1977	BATCH
	6	YES	1981	BATCH
	7	YES	1982	ON-LINE
MARYLAND	1	YES	1974	BATCH
	2	YES	1974	BATCH
	3	YES	1985	BATCH
MASSACHUSETTS	1	YES	1979	BATCH
	2	YES	1980	BATCH
	3	YES	1986	BATCH
	4	YES	1981	BATCH
	5	YES	1982	BATCH
MICHIGAN	1	YES	1979	BATCH
	2	YES	1978	BATCH
	3	YES	1982	ON-LINE
MINNESOTA	4	YES	1984	BATCH
	1	YES	1985	BATCH
	2	YES	1984	BATCH
	3	YES	D.K.	BATCH
MISSISSIPPI	4	YES	1986	BATCH
	1	YES	1984	BATCH
	2	YES	1983	BATCH
	3	YES	1985	BATCH
	4	YES	1985	BATCH
MISSOURI	5	YES	1985	BATCH
	1	YES	1973	BATCH
	2	YES	1969	BATCH
	3	YES	1986	ON-LINE
	4	YES	1986	BATCH
	5	YES	1986	BATCH
	6	YES	1979	ON-LINE
	7	YES	1979	ON-LINE
	8	YES	1985	ON-LINE
	9	YES	1979	ON-LINE
	10	YES	1979	ON-LINE
MONTANA	11	YES	1984	BATCH
	1	YES	1982	ON-LINE
	2	YES	1982	ON-LINE
	3	YES	1984	BATCH
NEBRASKA	4	YES	1984	BATCH
	1	YES	1985	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	BATCH
	3	YES	1982	BATCH
	4	YES	1985	BATCH
NEVADA	6	YES	1983	ON-LINE
	1	YES	1979	BATCH

Appendix Table A-3

General Characteristics of Matching Systems  
Conducted by State Food Stamp Programs  
By State by System

State	System	State Coverage? (Q2.01)	Yr. Begun For FSP (Q2.05)	Type of Access (Q5.00)
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1	YES	1981	BATCH
	2	YES	1981	BATCH
	3	YES	1981	BATCH
	4	YES	1978	BATCH
	5	YES	1986	BATCH
NEW JERSEY	1	YES	1981	BATCH
	2	YES	1974	BATCH
	3	YES	1985	ON-LINE
	4	YES	1981	ON-LINE
NEW MEXICO	1	YES	1982	BATCH
	2	YES	1982	ON-LINE
	3	YES	1984	BATCH
	4	YES	1984	BATCH
NEW YORK	1	YES	1978	BATCH
	2	NO	1984	BATCH
	3	NO	1982	BATCH
	4	YES	D.K.	ON-LINE
	5	YES	1981	BATCH
NORTH CAROLINA	1	YES	1986	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	BATCH
	3	YES	1984	ON-LINE
	4	YES	1984	ON-LINE
NORTH DAKOTA	1	YES	1984	BATCH
	2	YES	1984	BATCH
	3	YES	1984	BATCH
	4	YES	1984	BATCH
OKLAHOMA	1	YES	1985	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	BATCH
	3	YES	1985	BATCH
	4	YES	1985	BATCH
	5	YES	1985	BATCH
OREGON	1	YES	1977	BATCH
	2	YES	1983	BATCH
	3	YES	1980	BATCH
	4	YES	1981	BATCH
	5	YES	1984	BATCH
	6	YES	1985	BATCH
	7	YES	1973	BATCH
	8	YES	1977	ON-LINE
PENNSYLVANIA	1	YES	1984	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	BATCH
	3	YES	1981	BATCH
RHODE ISLAND	1	YES	1982	BATCH
	2	YES	1982	BATCH
	3	YES	1983	BATCH
	4	YES	1984	BATCH
	5	YES	1984	BATCH
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	YES	1984	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	ON-LINE
	3	YES	1986	BATCH
	4	YES	1984	ON-LINE
	5	YES	1986	ON-LINE

Appendix Table A-3

General Characteristics of Matching Systems  
Conducted by State Food Stamp Programs  
By State by System

State	System	State Coverage? (Q2.01)	Yr. Begun For FSP (Q2.05)	Type of Access (Q5.00)
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	YES	1984	BATCH
	2	YES	D.K.	BATCH
	3	YES	1983	BATCH
TENNESSEE	1	YES	1976	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	ON-LINE
TEXAS	1	YES	1974	BATCH
	2	YES	1984	BATCH
	3	YES	1984	BATCH
	4	YES	1984	BATCH
	5	YES	1979	BATCH
UTAH	1	YES	1984	BATCH
	2	YES	1977	BATCH
	3	NO	1986	ON-LINE
	4	YES	1986	ON-LINE
	5	YES	1986	ON-LINE
	6	YES	1978	ON-LINE
	7	YES	1980	BATCH
	8	YES	1975	BATCH
VERMONT	1	YES	1985	BATCH
	2	YES	1984	BATCH
	3	YES	1985	BATCH
	4	YES	1986	BATCH
VIRGINIA	1	YES	1975	BATCH
WASHINGTON	1	YES	1979	BATCH
	2	YES	1979	BATCH
	3	YES	1983	BATCH
	4	YES	1976	BATCH
WEST VIRGINIA	1	YES	1978	BATCH
	2	YES	1983	BATCH
	3	YES	1981	BATCH
	4	YES	1984	BATCH
WISCONSIN	1	YES	1984	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	BATCH
	3	YES	1983	BATCH
	4	YES	1984	BATCH
	5	YES	1986	BATCH
	6	YES	1978	BATCH
	7	YES	1978	ON-LINE
WYOMING	1	YES	1986	BATCH
	2	YES	1986	BATCH
	3	YES	1986	BATCH
GUAM	1	YES	1984	BATCH
	2	YES	1985	BATCH
	3	YES	1985	BATCH
	4	YES	1985	BATCH
	5	YES	1984	BATCH
VIRGIN ISLANDS	1	YES	1986	BATCH

Appendix Table A-4

Programs Using Match Systems  
By State by System  
(Q2.03)

State	System	Food Stamps	AFDC	G.A.	Medicare	CSE	SSI
ALABAMA	1	YES					
	2	YES	YES			YES	
ALASKA	1	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	3	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	4	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	5	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	6	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	7	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	8	YES	YES	YES	YES		
ARIZONA	1	YES	YES				
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES				
	4	YES	YES				
	5	YES	YES				
	6	YES					
	7	YES	YES				
ARKANSAS	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES					
	4	YES					
	5	YES					
	6	YES				YES	
CALIFORNIA	1	YES	YES	YES			
	2	YES					
	3	YES	YES				
COLORADO	1	YES	YES				
	2	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	3	YES				YES	
CONNECTICUT	4	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	1	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
	2	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
	3	YES	YES				
	4	YES	YES		YES		YES
DELAWARE	5	YES	YES				YES
	1	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES		
DIST. OF COL.	1	YES	YES	YES		YES	
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	3	YES	YES	YES			
	4	YES	YES	YES			
	5	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	6	YES	YES		YES	YES	
FLORIDA	1	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	2	YES					
	3	YES	YES				
GEORGIA	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES		
	4	YES	YES		YES		

Appendix Table A-4

Programs Using Match Systems  
By State by System  
(Q2.03)

State	System	Food Stamps	AFDC	G.A.	Medicare	CSE	SSI
HAWAII	1	YES	YES				
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES		
	4	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	5	YES	YES			YES	
IDAHO	1	YES	YES				YES
	2	YES					
	3	YES	YES				YES
	4	YES	YES				YES
	5	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
	6	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
	7	YES	YES			YES	YES
	8	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
ILLINOIS	1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	3	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	4	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	5	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	6	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	7	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	8	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	9	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
INDIANA	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	4	YES	YES		YES		
	5	YES	YES		YES		
IOWA	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES		
	4	YES	YES		YES		
KANSAS	1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	3	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	4	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	5	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	6	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	7	YES					
	8	YES	YES	YES	YES		
KENTUCKY	1	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	2	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	3	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	4	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	5	YES	YES		YES	YES	
LOUISIANA	1	YES	YES				
	2	YES	YES				
	3	YES				YES	
	4	YES	YES		YES		
	5	YES	YES		YES		
	6	YES	YES		YES	YES	

Appendix Table A-4

Programs Using Match Systems  
By State by System  
(Q2.03)

State	System	Food Stamps	AFDC	G.A.	Medicare	CSE	SSI
MAINE	1	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	4	YES	YES		YES		
	5	YES	YES		YES		
	6	YES	YES		YES		
	7	YES	YES		YES	YES	
MARYLAND	1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	3	YES	YES	YES	YES		
MASSACHUSETTS	1	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	3	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	4	YES					
	5	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
MICHIGAN	1	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES
	3	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES
	4	YES	YES	YES			
MINNESOTA	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES		
	4	YES					
MISSISSIPPI	1	YES	YES				
	2	YES	YES				
	3	YES	YES				
	4	YES	YES				
	5	YES	YES				
MISSOURI	1	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	2	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	3	YES	YES		YES		
	4	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	5	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	6	YES	YES		YES		
	7	YES	YES		YES		
	8	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	9	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	10	YES	YES		YES		
	11	YES					
MONTANA	1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	3	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	4	YES	YES	YES	YES		
NEBRASKA	1	YES	YES		YES		YES
	2	YES	YES		YES		YES
	3	YES	YES		YES		YES
	4	YES					
	6	YES					
NEVADA	1	YES	YES		YES	YES	

Appendix Table A-4

Programs Using Match Systems  
By State by System  
(Q2.03)

State	System	Food Stamps	AFDC	G.A.	Medicare	CSE	SSI
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
	2	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
	3	YES	YES		YES		YES
	4	YES	YES		YES		YES
	5	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
NEW JERSEY	1	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	2	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	3	YES	YES				
	4	YES	YES				
NEW MEXICO	1	YES	YES			YES	
	2	YES	YES			YES	
	3	YES					
	4	YES	YES				
NEW YORK	1	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	3	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	4	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	5	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
NORTH CAROLINA	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES		
	4	YES	YES		YES		
NORTH DAKOTA	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES		
	4	YES	YES		YES		
OKLAHOMA	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES		
	4	YES	YES		YES		
	5	YES	YES		YES		
OREGON	1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	3	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	4	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	5	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	6	YES					
	7	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
PENNSYLVANIA	1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	3	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	4	YES	YES		YES		
RHODE ISLAND	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES		
	4	YES				YES	
	5	YES	YES		YES		
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	YES	YES			YES	
	2	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	3	YES					
	4	YES	YES			YES	
	5	YES					

Appendix Table A-4

Programs Using Match Systems  
By State by System

State	System	Food Stamps	AFDC	G.A.	Medicare	CSE	SSI
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES			YES		
	3	YES	YES				
TENNESSEE	1	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	2	YES	YES		YES	YES	
TEXAS	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES		
	4	YES	YES		YES		
	5	YES	YES		YES		
UTAH	1	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	2	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	3	YES	YES	YES	YES		
	4	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	5	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	6	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	7	YES	YES		YES		
	8	YES	YES	YES	YES		
VERMONT	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES	YES	
	4	YES	YES		YES	YES	
VIRGINIA	1	YES	YES			YES	
WASHINGTON	1	YES	YES			YES	
	2	YES	YES			YES	
	3	YES					
	4	YES	YES				
WEST VIRGINIA	1	YES	YES				
	2	YES	YES				
	3	YES	YES		YES		
	4	YES	YES		YES		
WISCONSIN	1	YES	YES		YES		
	2	YES	YES		YES		
	3	YES	YES		YES		
	4	YES	YES		YES		
	5	YES	YES		YES		
	6	YES	YES		YES		
	7	YES	YES		YES		
WYOMING	1	YES	YES				
	2	YES	YES				
	3	YES	YES				
GUAM	1	YES					
	2	YES					
	3	YES					
	4	YES					
	5	YES					
VIRGIN ISLANDS	1	YES	YES	YES			



Appendix Table A-5

Frequency and Types of Food Stamp Cases  
Subject to Matching  
By State by System

State	System	Front-end Frequency (Q6.03A)	Types of Cases (Q6.03)	On-going Frequency (Q8.04)	Types of Cases (Q8.03)
ALABAMA	1	MONTHLY	ENTIRE		
	2	DAILY	OTHER	MONTHLY	OTHER
ALASKA	1		ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2		ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3		ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	5			WEEKLY	ENTIRE
	6		ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	7			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	8		ENTIRE		
ARIZONA	1			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	3			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	4	IMMED.	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	5	IMMED.	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	6		ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	7	OTHER	WKR OPT.	RECERT.	WKR OPT.
ARKANSAS	1			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2	MONTHLY	ENTIRE		
	3			ANNUALLY	ENTIRE
	4			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	5			OTHER	ENTIRE
	6	IMMED.	ENTIRE		
CALIFORNIA	1			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2	OTHER	WKR OPT.	RECERT.	WKR OPT.
	3	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE	ANNUALLY	ENTIRE
COLORADO	1	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2	IMMED.	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	3	IMMED.	FS/AFDC	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	4	IMMED.	OTHER	RECERT.	OTHER
CONNECTICUT	1	OTHER	WKR OPT.	WKR OPT.	WKR OPT.
	2	OTHER	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	3			RECERT.	ENTIRE
	4			ANNUALLY	ENTIRE
	5			RECERT.	ENTIRE
DELAWARE	1			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2	IMMED.	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
DIST. OF COL.	1			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	3			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	4			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	5			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	6	OTHER	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
FLORIDA	1	DAILY	ENTIRE	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	3			QUARTERLY	FS/AFDC
GEORGIA	1	DAILY	ENTIRE	OTHER	ENTIRE
	2	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4	DAILY	ENTIRE		

Appendix Table A-5

Frequency and Types of Food Stamp Cases  
Subject to Matching  
By State by System

State	System	Front-end Frequency (Q6.03A)	Types of Cases (Q6.03)	On-going Frequency (Q8.04)	Types of Cases (Q8.03)
HAWAII	1			ANNUALLY	ENTIRE
	2			ANNUALLY	ENTIRE
	3			ANNUALLY	ENTIRE
	4	DAILY	ENTIRE	BIMONTH	ENTIRE
	5			WKR OPT.	OTHER
IDAHO	1	MONTHLY	WKR OPT.		
	2			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	3			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4	MONTHLY	OTHER	MONTHLY	OTHER
	5	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	6	IMMED.	WKR OPT.	RECERT.	WKR OPT.
	7	IMMED.	WKR OPT.	BIMONTH	WKR OPT.
	8	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
ILLINOIS	1			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3			MONTHLY	OTHER
	4			ANNUALLY	OTHER
	5			ANNUALLY	ENTIRE
	6			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	7	DAILY	ENTIRE		
	8	DAILY	ENTIRE		
	9	DAILY	ENTIRE		
INDIANA	1			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3	WEEKLY	ENTIRE		
	4	MONTHLY	OTHER		
	5	MONTHLY	OTHER		
IOWA	1			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4			ANNUALLY	ENTIRE
KANSAS	1			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3			BIANNUAL	OTHER
	4	DAILY	ENTIRE		
	5	DAILY	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	6	DAILY	ENTIRE		
	7	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	8			MONTHLY	OTHER
KENTUCKY	1			RECERT.	ENTIRE
	2			RECERT.	ENTIRE
	3			RECERT.	ENTIRE
	4			RECERT.	ENTIRE
	5		ENTIRE		
LOUISIANA	1			RECERT.	ENTIRE
	2			RECERT.	ENTIRE
	3	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4			ANNUALLY	ENTIRE
	5	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	OTHER	ENTIRE
	6	DAILY	WKR OPT.	WKR OPT.	OTHER

Appendix Table A-5

Frequency and Types of Food Stamp Cases  
Subject to Matching  
By State by System

State	System	Front-end Frequency (Q6.03A)	Types of Cases (Q6.03)	On-going Frequency (Q8.04)	Types of Cases (Q8.03)
MAINE	1	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE	WEEKLY	ENTIRE
	2	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	3	DAILY	ENTIRE		
	4	OTHER	ENTIRE	ANNUALLY	ENTIRE
	5	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	6	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	BIMONTH	ENTIRE
	7	DAILY	ENTIRE		
MARYLAND	1	OTHER	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	2	OTHER	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	3		OTHER	RECERT.	OTHER
MASSACHUSETTS	1	MONTHLY	OTHER	QUARTERLY	OTHER
	2	WEEKLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	5				
MICHIGAN	1			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2			WEEKLY	ENTIRE
	3	DAILY	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	4			ANNUALLY	ENTIRE
MINNESOTA	1			QUARTERLY	OTHER
	2			MONTHLY	OTHER
	3	MONTHLY	ENTIRE		
	4			QUARTERLY	OTHER
MISSISSIPPI	1			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3		ENTIRE	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	4		ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	5			WEEKLY	OTHER
MISSOURI	1			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2			BIMONTH	ENTIRE
	3		.	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4			WEEKLY	ENTIRE
	5	DAILY	ENTIRE	OTHER	ENTIRE
	6	IMMED.	ENTIRE	OTHER	ENTIRE
	7	IMMED.	ENTIRE	WKR OPT.	ENTIRE
	8	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	WKR OPT.	ENTIRE
	9			WKR OPT.	ENTIRE
	10			WKR OPT.	ENTIRE
	11			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
MONTANA	1	DAILY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2	DAILY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
NEBRASKA	1	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	BIMONTH	ENTIRE
	3	WEEKLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4	DAILY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	6		ENTIRE		
NEVADA	1	WEEKLY	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE

Appendix Table A-5

Frequency and Types of Food Stamp Cases  
Subject to Matching  
By State by System

State	System	Front-end Frequency (Q6.03A)	Types of Cases (Q6.03)	On-going Frequency (Q8.04)	Types of Cases (Q8.03)
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	3	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	5	DAILY	ENTIRE		
NEW JERSEY	1			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	3	IMMED.	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	4	IMMED.	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
NEW MEXICO	1			RECERT.	ENTIRE
	2	IMMED.	ENTIRE		
	3			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	4			OTHER	OTHER
NEW YORK	1			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2	DAILY	ENTIRE	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	3	DAILY	ENTIRE		
	4			WKR OPT.	WKR OPT.
	5			WKR OPT.	WKR OPT.
NORTH CAROLINA	1	DAILY	ENTIRE		
	2			RECERT.	ENTIRE
	3	DAILY	ENTIRE		
	4	DAILY	ENTIRE		
NORTH DAKOTA	1			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
OKLAHOMA	1	WEEKLY	ENTIRE	WEEKLY	ENTIRE
	2	WEEKLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3	WEEKLY	ENTIRE	WEEKLY	ENTIRE
	4	WEEKLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	5	MONTHLY	OTHER	MONTHLY	FS/AFDC
OREGON	1			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	3			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	5			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	6			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	7			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	8	IMMED.	ENTIRE		
PENNSYLVANIA	1			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2		ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	3			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
RHODE ISLAND	1	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	FS/AFDC
	5	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	FS/AFDC
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	WEEKLY	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	2	IMMED.	ENTIRE	WKR OPT.	ENTIRE
	3	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4	DAILY	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	5	DAILY	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE

Appendix Table A-5

Frequency and Types of Food Stamp Cases  
Subject to Matching  
By State by System

State	System	Front-end Frequency (Q6.03A)	Types of Cases (Q6.03)	On-going Frequency (Q8.04)	Types of Cases (Q8.03)
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	OTHER	ENTIRE
	2	WEEKLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
TENNESSEE	1		ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	2	IMMED.	ENTIRE		
TEXAS	1			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2	WEEKLY	ENTIRE		
	3			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	5	DAILY	ENTIRE		
UTAH	1			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3	WEEKLY	ENTIRE		
	4	IMMED.	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
	5	IMMED.	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	6	IMMED.	ENTIRE	WKR OPT.	ENTIRE
	7			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	8			WEEKLY	ENTIRE
VERMONT	1	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	WEEKLY	ENTIRE
	2	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	BIMONTH	ENTIRE
	3	WEEKLY	ENTIRE	WEEKLY	ENTIRE
	4	MONTHLY	ENTIRE		
VIRGINIA	1	WEEKLY	ENTIRE	RECERT.	ENTIRE
WASHINGTON	1			MONTHLY	FS/AFDC
	2			QUARTERLY	FS/AFDC
	3			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4				
WEST VIRGINIA	1	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	2	MONTHLY		MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	4	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
WISCONSIN	1	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	BIANNUAL	ENTIRE
	4	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	5	MONTHLY	ENTIRE		
	6			MONTHLY	ENTIRE
WYOMING	7	IMMED.	ENTIRE		
	1	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
GUAM	3	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	ANNUALLY	ENTIRE
	1	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	2	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	3	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE		
VIRGIN ISLANDS	4	MONTHLY	ENTIRE	MONTHLY	ENTIRE
	5	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE	QUARTERLY	ENTIRE
	1			QUARTERLY	ENTIRE

Appendix Table A-6

Availability at the State Level of  
Information on Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Availability of Cost Data (Q3.01)	Availability of Activity and Outcome Data	
			Front-end Matching (Q7.00)	On-going Matching (Q9.00)
ALABAMA	1	NO	NO	NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
ALASKA	1	NO	NO	NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO	NO	NO
	4	NO		NO
	5	NO		NO
	6	NO	NO	NO
	7	NO		NO
ARIZONA	8	NO	NO	
	1	NO		NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO		NO
	4	NO	NO	NO
	5	NO	NO	NO
	6	NO	NO	NO
ARKANSAS	7	NO	NO	NO
	1	YES		NO
	2	YES	NO	
	3	YES		NO
	4	YES		NO
	5	YES		NO
	6	NO	NO	NO
CALIFORNIA	1	YES		YES
	2	NO	NO	YES
	3	NO	NO	YES
COLORADO	1	YES	NO	YES
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO	NO	NO
	4	YES	NO	NO
CONNECTICUT	1	NO	NO	NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO		NO
	4	NO		YES
	5			NO
DELAWARE	1	NO		NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
DIST. OF COL.	1	YES		NO
	2	YES		NO
	3	YES		NO
	4	YES		NO
	5	YES		NO
	6	YES	NO	NO
FLORIDA	1	NO	NO	YES
	2	NO		YES
	3	NO		YES

Appendix Table A-6

Availability at the State Level of  
Information on Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Availability of Cost Data (Q3.01)	Availability of Activity and Outcome Data	
			Front-end Matching (Q7.00)	On-going Matching (Q9.00)
GEORGIA	1	NO	NO	NO
	2	NO		NO
	3	NO		NO
	4	NO		NO
HAWAII	1	NO	NO	NO
	2	YES		NO
	3	NO		YES
	4	NO		NO
	5	NO		NO
IDAHO	1	NO	NO	
	2	NO		YES
	3	NO		NO
	4	NO		NO
	5	NO		NO
	6	NO		NO
	7	NO		NO
	8	YES		NO
ILLINOIS	1	YES	NO	YES
	2	NO		YES
	3	YES		YES
	4	YES		YES
	5	YES		YES
	6	YES		YES
	7	NO		
	8	NO		
	9	NO		
INDIANA	1	NO	YES NO NO NO	YES
	2	NO		NO
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
IOWA	1	NO		NO
	2	YES		NO
	3	YES,		NO
	4	NO		NO
KANSAS	1	NO	NO NO NO NO NO NO YES NO	NO
	2	NO		NO
	3	NO		NO
	4	NO		
	5	NO		NO
	6	NO		
	7	NO		YES
	8	NO		NO

Appendix Table A-6

Availability at the State Level of  
Information on Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Availability of Cost Data (Q3.01)	Availability of Activity and Outcome Data	
			Front-end Matching (Q7.00)	On-going Matching (Q9.00)
KENTUCKY	1	NO		YES
	2	NO		YES
	3	NO		YES
	4	NO		YES
	5	NO	YES	
LOUISIANA	1	NO		YES
	2	NO		YES
	3	NO	NO	YES
	4	NO		NO
	5	NO	NO	NO
MAINE	6	NO	NO	NO
	1	NO	NO	NO
	2	NO	NO	YES
	3	NO	YES	NO
	4	NO	NO	
	5	NO	NO	NO
MARYLAND	6	NO	NO	NO
	7	NO	NO	
	1	NO	NO	NO
MASSACHUSETTS	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO	NO	NO
	1	NO	NO	YES
	2	NO	NO	YES
MICHIGAN	3	NO		YES
	4	NO	NO	NO
	1	NO		YES
	2	NO		NO
	3	NO	NO	NO
MINNESOTA	4	NO		NO
	1	NO		NO
	2	NO		NO
	3	NO	NO	
MISSISSIPPI	4	NO		NO
	1	NO		NO
	2	NO		NO
	3	NO	NO	NO
	4	NO	NO	NO
MISSOURI	5	NO		NO
	1	NO		NO
	2	NO		NO
	3	NO		NO
	4	NO		NO
	5	NO	NO	NO
	6	NO	NO	NO



Appendix Table A-6

Availability at the State Level of  
Information on Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Availability of Cost Data (Q3.01)	Availability of Activity and Outcome Data	
			Front-end Matching (Q7.00)	On-going Matching (Q9.00)
MISSOURI	7	NO	NO	NO
	8	NO	NO	NO
	9	NO		NO
	10	NO		NO
	11	NO		NO
MONTANA	1	NO	NO	NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO		NO
	4	NO		NO
NEBRASKA	1	NO	NO	NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO	NO	NO
	4	NO	NO	NO
	6	NO	NO	
NEVADA	1	NO	NO	NO
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1	NO		NO
	2	NO		NO
	3	NO	NO	NO
	4	NO	NO	NO
	5	NO	NO	
NEW JERSEY	1	NO		YES
	2	NO		YES
	3	NO	NO	
	4	NO	NO	
NEW MEXICO	1	NO		NO
	2	NO	NO	
	3	NO		YES
	4	NO		NO
NEW YORK	1	NO		NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO		NO
	4	NO		NO
	5	NO		NO
NORTH CAROLINA	1	NO	NO	
	2	NO		NO
	3	NO	NO	
	4	NO	NO	
NORTH DAKOTA	1	NO		NO
	2	NO		NO
	3	NO		NO
	4	NO		NO
OKLAHOMA	1	NO	NO	NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO	NO	NO
	4	NO	NO	NO
	5	NO	NO	NO

Appendix Table A-6

Availability at the State Level of  
Information on Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Availability of Cost Data (Q3.01)	Availability of Activity and Outcome Data	
			Front-end Matching (Q7.00)	On-going Matching (Q9.00)
OREGON	1	NO		NO
	2	NO		NO
	3	NO		NO
	4	NO		NO
	5	NO		NO
	6	NO		NO
	7	NO		YES
	8	NO	NO	
PENNSYLVANIA	1	NO		NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO		NO
RHODE ISLAND	1	YES	NO	YES
	2	YES	NO	YES
	3	YES	NO	YES
	4	YES	NO	NO
	5	YES	NO	NO
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	NO	NO	NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO	NO	NO
	4	NO	NO	NO
	5	NO	NO	NO
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	YES	YES	NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	YES	YES	NO
TENNESSEE	1	NO	NO	NO
	2	NO	NO	
TEXAS	1	NO		NO
	2	YES	NO	
	3	YES		NO
	4	YES		D.K.
	5	NO	NO	
UTAH	1	YES		NO
	2	YES		NO
	3	NO	NO	
	4	NO	NO	NO
	5	NO	NO	NO
	6	YES	NO	NO
	7	YES		NO
	8	YES		YES
VERMONT	1	NO	NO	NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO	NO	NO
	4	NO	NO	NO
VIRGINIA	1	NO	NO	NO

Appendix Table A-6

Availability at the State Level of  
Information on Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Availability of Cost Data (Q3.01)	Availability of Activity and Outcome Data	
			Front-end Matching (Q7.00)	On-going Matching (Q9.00)
WASHINGTON	1	NO		YES
	2	NO		YES
	3	NO		YES
	4	NO		
WEST VIRGINIA	1	YES	NO	NO
	2	YES		NO
	3	YES	NO	NO
	4	YES	NO	NO
WISCONSIN	1	YES	NO	YES
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO	NO	YES
	4	NO	NO	NO
	5	NO	NO	
	6	NO		YES
	7	NO	NO	
WYOMING	1	YES	NO	YES
	2	NO		YES
	3	NO	NO	YES
GUAM	1	NO	YES	NO
	2	NO	NO	NO
	3	NO	NO	
	4	NO	NO	NO
	5	NO	NO	NO
VIRGIN ISLANDS	1	YES		NO



Appendix Table A-7

Time Lapses for Receipt  
of Match Information  
By State by System

Lapse Between Match Initiation and  
Time Info. is Received by Locals

State	System Number	Data Request (Q5.02)	Match Type (Q5.00)	Front-end Matching (Q6.10)	On-going Matching (Q8.11)
KENTUCKY	1	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	2	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	3	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	4	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	5	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	
LOUISIANA	1	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	2	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	3	IMMED.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	4	IMMED.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	5	D.K.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	6	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
MAINE	1	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	2	2-5 DAYS	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	3	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	
	4	GT 1 MONTH	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	5	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	6	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	7	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	
MARYLAND	1	SAME DAY	BATCH	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	2	SAME DAY	BATCH	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	3	SAME DAY	BATCH	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
MASSACHUSETTS	1	2-5 DAYS	BATCH	1-4 WKS	1-4 WKS
	2	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	1-4 WKS	1-4 WKS
	3	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		1-4 WKS
	4	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	1-4 MONTHS	
	5	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		
MICHIGAN	1	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	2	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	3	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	4	GT 1 MONTH	BATCH		VARIES
MINNESOTA	1	2-5 DAYS	BATCH		1-4 WKS
	2	2-5 DAYS	BATCH		1-4 WKS
	3	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	1-4 WKS	
	4	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		1-4 WKS
MISSISSIPPI	1	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	2	2-5 DAYS	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	3	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	4	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	5	SAME DAY	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
MISSOURI	1	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	2	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	3	OVERNIGHT	ON-LINE		2-7 DAYS
	4	2-5 DAYS	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	5	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	6	OVERNIGHT	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY

Appendix Table A-7

Time Lapses for Receipt  
of Match Information  
By State by System

Lapse Between Match Initiation and  
Time Info. is Received by Locals

State	System Number	Data Request (Q5.02)	Match Type (Q5.00)	Front-end Matching (Q6.10)	On-going Matching (Q8.11)
MISSOURI	7	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	8	OVERNIGHT	ON-LINE	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	9	IMMED.	ON-LINE		LT 1 DAY
	10	IMMED.	ON-LINE		LT 1 DAY
	11	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		1-4 MONTHS
MONTANA	1	IMMED.	ON-LINE	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	2	IMMED.	ON-LINE	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	3	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	4	GT 1 MONTH	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
NEBRASKA	1	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	2	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	3	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	4	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	6	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	
NEVADA	1	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1	2-5 DAYS	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	2	2-5 DAYS	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	3	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	4	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	5	2-5 DAYS	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	
NEW JERSEY	1	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		1-4 WKS
	2	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		1-4 WKS
	3	1-4 WKS.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	4	1-4 WKS.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
NEW MEXICO	1	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	2	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	
	3	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	4	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
NEW YORK	1	VARIES	BATCH		1-4 WKS
	2	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	LT 1 DAY	1-4 WKS
	3	2-5 DAYS	BATCH	LT 1 DAY	
	4	IMMED.	ON-LINE		
	5	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
NORTH CAROLINA	1	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	LT 1 DAY	
	2	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		LT 1 DAY
	3	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	
	4	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	
NORTH DAKOTA	1	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		OVERNIGHT
	2	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		OVERNIGHT
	3	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		OVERNIGHT
	4	D.K.	BATCH		OVERNIGHT
OKLAHOMA	1	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	2	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	1-4 WKS	1-4 WKS
	3	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	4	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	1-4 WKS	1-4 WKS
	5	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	1-4 WKS	2-7 DAYS

# Appendix Table A-7

## Time Lapses for Receipt of Match Information By State by System

Lapse Between Match Initiation and  
Time Info. is Received by Locals

State	System Number	Data Request (Q5.02)	Match Type (Q5.00)	Front-end Matching (Q6.10)	On-going Matching (Q8.11)
OREGON	1	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	2	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	3	2-5 DAYS	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	4	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	5	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	6	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		LT 1 DAY
	7	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		LT 1 DAY
	8	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	
PENNSYLVANIA	1	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		1-4 WKS
	2	SAME DAY	BATCH	LT 1 DAY	2-7 DAYS
	3	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		1-4 WKS
RHODE ISLAND	1	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	2	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	3	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	4	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	5	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	2-5 DAYS	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	2	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	3	2-5 DAYS	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	4	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	5	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	IMMED.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	2	IMMED.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	3	IMMED.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
TENNESSEE	1	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	OVERNIGHT	OVERNIGHT
	2	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	
TEXAS	1	IMMED.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	2	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	
	3	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	4	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	5	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	
UTAH	1	2-5 DAYS	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	2	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	3	IMMED.	ON-LINE	2-7 DAYS	
	4	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	5	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	6	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	LT 1 DAY
	7	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		1-4 MONTHS
	8	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
VERMONT	1	IMMED.	BATCH	OVERNIGHT	OVERNIGHT
	2	IMMED.	BATCH	OVERNIGHT	OVERNIGHT
	3	IMMED.	BATCH	OVERNIGHT	OVERNIGHT
	4	D.K.	BATCH	OVERNIGHT	OVERNIGHT
VIRGINIA	1	2-5 DAYS	BATCH	1-4 WKS	1-4 WKS

Appendix Table A-7

Time Lapses for Receipt  
of Match Information  
By State by System

Lapse Between Match Initiation and  
Time Info. is Received by Locals

State	System Number	Data Request (Q5.02)	Match Type (Q5.00)	Front-end Matching (Q6.10)	On-going Matching (Q8.11)
WASHINGTON	1	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	2	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	3	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	4	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		
WEST VIRGINIA	1	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	2	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	3	SAME DAY	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	4	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
WISCONSIN	1	2-5 DAYS	BATCH	OVERNIGHT	OVERNIGHT
	2	2-5 DAYS	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	3	2-5 DAYS	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	4	2-5 DAYS	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	5	2-5 DAYS	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	
	6	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	7	IMMED.	ON-LINE	LT 1 DAY	
WYOMING	1	OVERNIGHT	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	2	OVERNIGHT	BATCH		2-7 DAYS
	3	GT 1 MONTH	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
GUAM	1	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	2	GT 1 MONTH	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	3	GT 1 MONTH	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	
	4	1-4 WKS.	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
	5	GT 1 MONTH	BATCH	2-7 DAYS	2-7 DAYS
VIRGIN ISLANDS	1	1-4 WKS.	BATCH		2-7 DAYS



Appendix Table A-8

Use of Discrepancy Factors in  
Front-End Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Income/wage Discrepancy (Q6.05)	\$ Amount (Q6.06_AMT)	Per Time Period (Q6.06_PER)	Non-wage Discrepancy (Q6.07)	Factor (Q6.08)
<hr/>						
ALABAMA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
ALASKA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4					
	5					
	6	NO			NO	
	7					
ARIZONA	8	NO			NO	
	1					
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
ARKANSAS	7	NO			NO	
	1					
	2	NO				
	3					
	4					
	5					
	6	NO				
CALIFORNIA	1					
	2	NO			NO	
	3	YES	10	YEAR	NO	
COLORADO	1	YES	275	QTR.	NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
CONNECTICUT	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4					
	5					
DELAWARE	1					
DIST. OF COL.	2	NO			NO	
	1					
	2					
	3					
	4					
FLORIDA	5					
	6	NO			NO	
	1	NO			NO	
	2					
	3					
GEORGIA	1	YES	75	QTR.	NO	
	2	NO				
	3	NO				
	4	NO				

Appendix Table A-8

Use of Discrepancy Factors in  
Front-End Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Income/wage Discrepancy (Q6.05)	\$ Amount (Q6.06_AMT)	Per Time Period (Q6.06_PER)	Non-wage Discrepancy (Q6.07)	Factor (Q6.08)
HAWAII	1					
	2					
	3					
	4	NO			NO	
	5					
IDAHO	1	NO			NO	
	2					
	3					
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
	7	NO			NO	
	8	NO			NO	
ILLINOIS	1					
	2					
	3					
	4					
	5					
	6					
	7	NO			NO	
	8	YES			NO	
	9	NO	1	MONTH	NO	
INDIANA	1				NO	
	2					
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
IOWA	1					
	2					
	3					
	4					
KANSAS	1					
	2					
	3					
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
	7	NO			NO	
	8					
KENTUCKY	1					
	2					
	3					
	4					
	5	NO			NO	
LOUISIANA	1					
	2					
	3	NO			NO	
	4					
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	

Appendix Table A-8

Use of Discrepancy Factors in  
Front-End Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Income/wage Discrepancy (Q6.05)	\$ Amount (Q6.06_AMT)	Per Time Period (Q6.06_PER)	Non-wage Discrepancy (Q6.07)	Factor (Q6.08)
<hr/>						
ALABAMA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
ALASKA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4					
	5					
	6	NO			NO	
	7					
ARIZONA	8	NO			NO	
	1					
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
ARKANSAS	7	NO			NO	
	1					
	2	NO				
	3					
	4					
	5					
	6	NO				
CALIFORNIA	1					
	2	NO				
	3	YES			NO	
COLORADO	1	YES	10	YEAR	NO	
	2	YES	275	QTR.	NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
CONNECTICUT	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4					
	5					
DELAWARE	1					
DIST. OF COL.	2	NO			NO	
	1					
	2					
	3					
	4					
	5					
FLORIDA	6	NO			NO	
	1	NO			NO	
	2					
	3					
GEORGIA	1	YES	75	QTR.	NO	
	2	NO				
	3	NO				
	4	NO				

Appendix Table A-8

Use of Discrepancy Factors in  
Front-End Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Income/wage Discrepancy (Q6.05)	\$ Amount (Q6.06_AMT)	Per Time Period (Q6.06_PER)	Non-wage Discrepancy (Q6.07)	Factor (Q6.08)
MAINE	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			YES	TOL (\$700)
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
	7	NO			NO	
MARYLAND	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
MASSACHUSETTS	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4	NO			NO	
	5					
MICHIGAN	1					
	2					
	3	NO			NO	
	4					
MINNESOTA	1					
	2					
	3	NO			NO	
	4					
MISSISSIPPI	1					
	2					
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5					
MISSOURI	1					
	2					
	3					
	4					
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
	7	NO			NO	
	8	NO			NO	
	9					
	10					
	11					
MONTANA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4					
NEBRASKA	1	NO			YES	SSN DISCREPANCY
	2	NO			YES	SSN DISCREPANCY
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
NEVADA	1	NO				

# Appendix Table A-8

## Use of Discrepancy Factors in Front-End Computer Matching By State by System

State	System Number	Income/wage Discrepancy (Q6.05)	\$ Amount (Q6.06_AMT)	Per Time Period (Q6.06_PER)	Non-wage Discrepancy (Q6.07)	Factor (Q6.08)
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1					
	2					
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			YES	TOL (\$1.00)
	5	NO			NO	
NEW JERSEY	1					
	2					
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
NEW MEXICO	1					
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4					
NEW YORK	1					
	2	NO			YES	TOL (\$250)
	3	NO				
	4					
	5					
NORTH CAROLINA	1	NO			NO	
	2					
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
NORTH DAKOTA	1					
	2					
	3					
	4					
OKLAHOMA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	YES	200	QTR.	NO	
	5	NO			NO	
OREGON	1					
	2					
	3					
	4					
	5					
	6					
	7					
	8	NO			NO	
PENNSYLVANIA	1					
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
RHODE ISLAND	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	

Appendix Table A-8

Use of Discrepancy Factors in  
Front-End Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Income/wage Discrepancy (Q6.05)	\$ Amount (Q6.06_AMT)	Per Time Period (Q6.06_PER)	Non-wage Discrepancy (Q6.07)	Factor (Q6.08)
<hr/>						
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
TENNESSEE	1	NO				
	2	NO				
TEXAS	1					
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4					
	5	NO			NO	
UTAH	1					
	2					
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
	7					
	8					
VERMONT	1	NO				
	2	NO				
	3	NO				
	4	NO				
VIRGINIA	1	NO			NO	
WASHINGTON	1					
	2					
	3					
	4					
WEST VIRGINIA	1	NO				
	2					
	3	NO				
	4	NO				
WISCONSIN	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			YES	TOL (20,000)
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6					
	7	NO			NO	
GUAM	2					
	3	NO			YES	TOL (VARIES)
	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	YES	600	YEAR	NO	
VIRGIN ISLANDS	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	1					

Appendix Table A-9

Use of Discrepancy Factors in  
On-Going Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Income/wage Discrepancy (Q8.06)	\$ Amount (Q8.07_AMT)	Per Time Period (Q8.07_PER)	Non-wage Discrepancy (Q8.08)	Factor (Q8.09)
ALABAMA	1					
	2	NO				
ALASKA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	YES	5	MONTH	NO	
	5	YES	5	MONTH	NO	
	6	NO			NO	
	7	NO			NO	
	8					
ARIZONA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			YES	TOL (\$2400)
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
	7	NO			NO	
ARKANSAS	1	NO			NO	
	2					
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6					
CALIFORNIA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	YES	10	YEAR	NO	
COLORADO	1	YES	275	QTR.	NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
CONNECTICUT	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	YES	150	QTR.	NO	
	4	YES	D.K.	D.K.	NO	
	5	YES	1	MONTH	NO	
DELAWARE	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
DIST. OF COL.	1	NO				
	2	NO				
	3	NO				
	4	NO				
	5	NO				
	6	NO				
FLORIDA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
GEORGIA	1	YES	75	QTR.	NO	
	2	NO				
	3	NO				
	4					

Appendix Table A-9

Use of Discrepancy Factors in  
On-Going Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Income/wage Discrepancy (Q8.06)	\$ Amount (Q8.07_AMT)	Per Time Period (Q8.07_PER)	Non-wage Discrepancy (Q8.08)	Factor (Q8.09)
HAWAII	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
IDAHO	1					
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
	7	NO			NO	
	8	NO			NO	
ILLINOIS	1	YES	25	QTR.	NO	
	2	NO			YES	15% DISCREPANCY
	3	YES	1	MONTH	NO	
	4	YES	1	YEAR	NO	
	5	NO			YES	PROPERTY VALUE
	6	NO			NO	
	7					
	8					
	9					
INDIANA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4					
	5					
IOWA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
KANSAS	1	NO				
	2	NO				
	3	NO				
	4					
	5	NO				
	6					
	7	NO			NO	
KENTUCKY	8	NO			NO	
	1	YES			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
LOUISIANA	5					
	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	



Appendix Table A-9

Use of Discrepancy Factors in  
On-Going Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Income/wage Discrepancy (Q8.06)	\$ Amount (Q8.07_AMT)	Per Time Period (Q8.07_PER)	Non-wage Discrepancy (Q8.08)	Factor (Q8.09)
MAINE	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4	NO			YES	TOL (\$700)
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
	7					
MARYLAND	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
MASSACHUSETTS	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	YES	1	NONE	NO	
	5					
MICHIGAN	1	NO				
	2	NO				
	3	NO				
	4	YES	1600	YEAR	YES	M.V.
MINNESOTA	1	YES	1000	QTR.	NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4	NO			NO	
MISSISSIPPI	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
MISSOURI	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
	7	NO			NO	
	8	NO			NO	
	9	NO			NO	
	10	NO			NO	
	11	NO			NO	
MONTANA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
NEBRASKA	1	NO			YES	SSN DISCREPANCY
	2	NO			YES	SSN DISCREPANCY
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			YES	TOL (\$10,000)
NEVADA	6					
	1	NO				

Appendix Table A-9

Use of Discrepancy Factors in  
On-Going Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Income/wage Discrepancy (Q8.06)	\$ Amount (Q8.07_AMT)	Per Time Period (Q8.07_PER)	Non-wage Discrepancy (Q8.08)	Factor (Q8.09)
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1	NO			YES	TOL (\$400)
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			YES	TOL (\$1.00)
	5					
NEW JERSEY	1	YES	100	QTR.	NO	
	2	YES	5	MONTH	NO	
	3	NO				
	4	NO				
NEW MEXICO	1	NO			NO	
	2					
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
NEW YORK	1	NO			YES	BENEFIT CHANGE
	2	NO			YES	TOL (\$250)
	3					
	4					
	5	NO			NO	
NORTH CAROLINA	1					
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4					
NORTH DAKOTA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
OKLAHOMA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	YES	200	QTR.	NO	
	5	NO			NO	
OREGON	1	NO			NO	
	2	YES	75	QTR.	NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
	7	NO			NO	
PENNSYLVANIA	8					
	1	YES	500	QTR.	YES	\$500 INC. CHANGE
	2	NO			NO	
RHODE ISLAND	3	NO			YES	TOL (\$250)
	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
SOUTH CAROLINA	5	NO			NO	
	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	

Appendix Table A-9

Use of Discrepancy Factors in  
On-Going Computer Matching  
By State by System

State	System Number	Income/wage Discrepancy (Q8.06)	\$ Amount (Q8.07_AMT)	Per Time Period (Q8.07_PER)	Non-wage Discrepancy (Q8.08)	Factor (Q8.09)
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			NO	
TENNESSEE	1	NO				
	2					
TEXAS	1	NO			NO	
	2					
	3	NO			NO	
	4	YES	150	QTR.	NO	
	5					
UTAH	1	NO			NO	
	2	YES	25	MONTH	NO	
	3					
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
	6	NO			NO	
	7	NO			NO	
	8	NO			NO	
VERMONT	1	NO				
	2	NO				
	3	NO				
	4					
VIRGINIA	1	NO			NO	
WASHINGTON	1	YES	25	MONTH	NO	
	2	YES	25	QTR.	NO	
	3	NO			NO	
	4					
WEST VIRGINIA	1	NO				
	2	NO				
	3	NO				
	4	NO				
WISCONSIN	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3	NO			YES	TOL (\$20,000)
	4	NO			NO	
	5					
	6	NO			NO	
	7					
WYOMING	1	YES	100	MONTH	NO	
	2	YES	800	QTR.	NO	
	3	NO			YES	TOL (VARIES)
GUAM	1	NO			NO	
	2	NO			NO	
	3					
	4	NO			NO	
	5	NO			NO	
VIRGIN ISLANDS	1	YES	75	QTR.	NO	

Appendix Table A-10

Prioritization of Cases  
for Follow-up after Matching  
Front-End Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Priority Used? (Q6.12)	Priority Factor (Q6.13)
ALABAMA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
ALASKA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4		
	5		
	6	NO	
ARIZONA	7		
	8	NO	
	1		
	2	NO	
	3		
	4	NO	
ARKANSAS	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7	NO	
	1		
	2	NO	
	3		
CALIFORNIA	4		
	5		
	6	NO	
	1		
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
COLORADO	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
CONNECTICUT	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3		
	4		
	5		
DELAWARE	1		
DIST. OF COL.	2	YES	ACTIVE/INACTIVE
	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
FLORIDA	6	NO	
	1	NO	
	2		
GEORGIA	3		
	1	YES	\$ GT DISCREPANCY
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	

Appendix Table A-10

Prioritization of Cases  
for Follow-up after Matching  
Front-End Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Priority Used? (Q6.12)	Priority Factor (Q6.13)
HAWAII	1		
	2		
	3		
	4	NO	
	5		
IDAHO	1	NO	
	2		
	3		
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7	NO	
	8	NO	
ILLINOIS	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
	7	NO	
	8	NO	
	9	NO	
INDIANA	1		
	2		
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
IOWA	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
KANSAS	1		
	2		
	3		
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7	NO	
	8		
KENTUCKY	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5	NO	
LOUISIANA	1		
	2		
	3	NO	
	4		
	5	NO	
	6	NO	

Appendix Table A-10

Prioritization of Cases  
for Follow-up after Matching  
Front-End Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Priority Used? (Q6.12)	Priority Factor (Q6.13)
MAINE	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7	NO	
MARYLAND	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
MASSACHUSETTS	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3		
	4	NO	
	5		
MICHIGAN	1		
	2		
	3	NO	
	4		
MINNESOTA	1		
	2		
	3	YES	CHRONOLOGICAL
	4		
MISSISSIPPI	1		
	2		
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5		
MISSOURI	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7	NO	
	8	NO	
	9		
	10		
	11		
MONTANA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3		
	4		
NEBRASKA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	6	NO	
NEVADA	1	NO	

Appendix Table A-10

Prioritization of Cases  
for Follow-up after Matching  
Front-End Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Priority Used? (Q6.12)	Priority Factor (Q6.13)
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1		
	2		
	3	NO	
	4	YES	OTHER
	5	NO	
NEW JERSEY	1		
	2		
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
NEW MEXICO	1		
	2	NO	
	3		
	4		
NEW YORK	1		
	2	YES	CHRONOLOGICAL
	3	NO	
	4		
	5		
NORTH CAROLINA	1	NO	
	2		
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
NORTH DAKOTA	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
OKLAHOMA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
OREGON	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
	7		
	8	NO	
PENNSYLVANIA	1		
	2	NO	
	3		
RHODE ISLAND	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	

Appendix Table A-10

Prioritization of Cases  
for Follow-up after Matching  
Front-End Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Priority Used? (Q6.12)	Priority Factor (Q6.13)
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
TENNESSEE	1	NO	
	2	NO	
TEXAS	1		
	2	YES	TOLERANCE/DISCR.
	3		
	4		
	5	NO	
UTAH	1		
	2		
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7		
	8		
VERMONT	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
VIRGINIA	1	NO	
WASHINGTON	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
WEST VIRGINIA	1	YES	INCOME/WAGE
	2		
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
WISCONSIN	1	YES	TOLERANCE/DISCR.
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6		
WYOMING	7	NO	
	1	YES	\$ GT DISCREPANCY
	2		
GUAM	3	YES	TOLERANCE/DISCR.
	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	YES	\$ GT DISCREPANCY
	4	NO	
VIRGIN ISLANDS	5	NO	
	1		



Appendix Table A-11

Prioritization of Cases  
for Follow-up after Matching  
On-Going Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Priority Used? (Q8.13)	Priority Factor (Q8.14)
ALABAMA	1		
	2	NO	
ALASKA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7	NO	
	8		
ARIZONA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7	NO	
ARKANSAS	1	NO	
	2		
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6		
CALIFORNIA	1	YES	INCOME/WAGE
	2	NO	
	3	YES	\$ AMOUNT - ASSET
COLORADO	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
CONNECTICUT	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	YES	BENEFIT AMOUNT
	5	NO	
DELAWARE	1	YES	INCOME/WAGE
	2	NO	
DIST. OF COL.	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
FLORIDA	1	YES	\$ GT DISCREPANCY
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
GEORGIA	1	YES	\$ GT DISCREPANCY
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4		

Appendix Table A-11

Prioritization of Cases  
for Follow-up after Matching  
On-Going Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Priority Used? (08.13)	Priority Factor (08.14)
HAWAII	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
IDAHO	1		
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7	NO	
	8	NO	
ILLINOIS	1	YES	\$ GT DISCREPANCY
	2	YES	\$ GT DISCREPANCY
	3	NO	
	4	YES	\$ GT DISCREPANCY
	5	NO	
	6	YES	INCOME/WAGE
	7		
	8		
	9		
INDIANA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3		
	4		
	5		
IOWA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
KANSAS	1	YES	INCOME/WAGE
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4		
	5	NO	
	6		
	7	NO	
KENTUCKY	8	NO	
	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
LOUISIANA	5		
	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	

## Appendix Table A-11

Prioritization of Cases  
for Follow-up after Matching  
On-Going Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Priority Used? (08.13)	Priority Factor (08.14)
MAINE	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3		
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7		
MARYLAND	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
MASSACHUSETTS	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4		
	5		
MICHIGAN	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
MINNESOTA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3		
MISSISSIPPI	4	NO	
	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
MISSOURI	5	NO	
	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7	NO	
	8	NO	
	9	NO	
	10	NO	
MONTANA	11	NO	
	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
NEBRASKA	4	NO	
	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
NEVADA	6		
	1	NO	

## Appendix Table A-11

Prioritization of Cases  
for Follow-up after Matching  
On-Going Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Priority Used? (08.13)	Priority Factor (08.14)
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1	YES	\$ GT DISCREPANCY
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	YES	
	5		
NEW JERSEY	1	YES	\$ GT DISCREPANCY
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
NEW MEXICO	1	NO	
	2		
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
NEW YORK	1	YES	CHRONOLOGICAL CHRONOLOGICAL
	2	YES	
	3		
	4		
	5	NO	
NORTH CAROLINA	1		
	2	NO	
	3		
	4		
NORTH DAKOTA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
OKLAHOMA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
OREGON	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7	NO	
PENNSYLVANIA	8		
	1	YES	
	2	NO	
RHODE ISLAND	3	NO	TOLERANCE/DISCR.
	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
SOUTH CAROLINA	5	NO	
	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5	NO	

Appendix Table A-11

Prioritization of Cases  
for Follow-up after Matching  
On-Going Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Priority Used? (08.13)	Priority Factor (08.14)
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
TENNESSEE	1	NO	
	2		
TEXAS	1	NO	
	2		
	3	NO	
	4	YES	TOLERANCE/DISCR.
UTAH	5		
	1	YES	VARIES BY TYPE OF CASE
	2	NO	
	3		
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
	6	NO	
	7	NO	
VERMONT	8	NO	
	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
VIRGINIA	4		
	1	NO	
WASHINGTON	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4		
WEST VIRGINIA	1	YES	INCOME/WAGE
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
WISCONSIN	1	YES	TOLERANCE/DISCR.
	2	NO	
	3	NO	
	4	NO	
	5		
	6	NO	
	7		
WYOMING	1	YES	\$ GT DISCREPANCY
	2	YES	\$ GT DISCREPANCY
	3	YES	TOLERANCE/DISCR.
GUAM	1	NO	
	2	NO	
	3		
	4	NO	
	5	NO	
VIRGIN ISLANDS	1	NO	

Appendix Table A-12

State Requirements for Local Reporting  
On Computer Matching  
Front-End Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Must Locals Submit Report? (Q6.19)	Frequency of Local Reports (Q6.20)	Content (Q6.21)
ALABAMA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
ALASKA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4			
	5			
	6	NO		
	7			
ARIZONA	8	NO		
	1			
	2	NO		
	3			
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
ARKANSAS	7	NO		
	1			
	2	NO		
	3			
	4			
	5			
	6	NO		
CALIFORNIA	1			
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
COLORADO	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
CONNECTICUT	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3			
	4			
DELAWARE	5			
	1			
	2	NO		
DIST. OF COL.	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5			
FLORIDA	6	NO		
	1	YES	QUARTER	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2			
	3			
GEORGIA	1	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2			
	3			
	4	NO		

Appendix Table A-12

State Requirements for Local Reporting  
On Computer Matching  
Front-End Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Must Locals Submit Report? (Q6.19)	Frequency of Local Reports (Q6.20)	Content (Q6.21)
HAWAII	1			
	2			
	3			
	4	NO		
	5			
IDAHO	1	NO		
	2			
	3			
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	7	NO		
ILLINOIS	8	NO		
	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5			
	6			
	7	NO		
INDIANA	8	NO		
	9	NO		
	1			
	2			
	3	NO		
IOWA	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	1			
	2			
KANSAS	3			
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
KENTUCKY	7	YES	VARIES	TURN AROUND DOCUMENT
	8			
	1			
LOUISIANA	2			
	3	NO		
	4			
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	1			

Appendix Table A-12

State Requirements for Local Reporting  
On Computer Matching  
Front-End Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Must Locals Submit Report? (Q6.19)	Frequency of Local Reports (Q6.20)	Content (Q6.21)
MAINE	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	7	NO		
MARYLAND	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
MASSACHUSETTS	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3			
	4	NO		
	5			
MICHIGAN	1			
	2			
	3	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	4			
MINNESOTA	1			
	2			
	3	YES	QUARTER	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	4			
MISSISSIPPI	1			
	2			
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5			
MISSOURI	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	7	NO		
	8	NO		
	9			
	10			
	11			
MONTANA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3			
	4			
NEBRASKA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
NEVADA	6	YES	MONTHLY	DUPLICATE PARTIC. ATTEMPTS
	1	NO		



Appendix Table A-12

State Requirements for Local Reporting  
On Computer Matching  
Front-End Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Must Locals Submit Report? (Q6.19)	Frequency of Local Reports (Q6.20)	Content (Q6.21)
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1			
	2			
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
NEW JERSEY	1			
	2			
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
NEW MEXICO	1			
	2	YES	VARIES	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	3			
	4			
NEW YORK	1			
	2	NO		
	3	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	4			
	5			
NORTH CAROLINA	1	NO		
	2			
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
NORTH DAKOTA	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
OKLAHOMA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
OREGON	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5			
	6			
	7			
	8	NO		
PENNSYLVANIA	1			
	2	NO		
	3			
RHODE ISLAND	1	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	3	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		

Appendix Table A-12

State Requirements for Local Reporting  
On Computer Matching  
Front-End Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Must Locals Submit Report? (Q6.19)	Frequency of Local Reports (Q6.20)	Content (Q6.21)
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
TENNESSEE	1	NO		
	2	NO		
TEXAS	1			
	2	NO		
	3			
	4			
	5	NO		
UTAH	1			
	2			
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	7			
	8			
VERMONT	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
VIRGINIA	1	NO		
WASHINGTON	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
WEST VIRGINIA	1	NO		
	2			
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
WISCONSIN	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6			
WYOMING	7	NO		
	1	YES	VARIES	TURNAROUND DOCUMENT
	2			
GUAM	3	YES	VARIES	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	1	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	3	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	4	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
VIRGIN ISLANDS	5	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	1			

Appendix Table A-13

State Requirements for Local Reporting  
On Computer Matching  
On-Going Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Must Locals Submit Report? (Q8.20)	Frequency of Local Reports (Q8.21)	Content (Q8.22)
ALABAMA	1			
	2	NO		
ALASKA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	7	NO		
	8			
ARIZONA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	7	NO		
ARKANSAS	1	NO		
	2			
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6			
CALIFORNIA	1	YES	VARIES	CLAIM REFERRALS
	2	NO		
	3	YES	MONTHLY	CLAIM REFERRALS
COLORADO	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
CONNECTICUT	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	YES	WEEKLY	CLAIM REFERRALS
	5	NO		
DELAWARE	1	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
DIST. OF COL.	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
FLORIDA	1	YES	QUARTER	CLAIM REFERRALS
	2	YES	QUARTER	CLAIM REFERRALS
	3	YES	QUARTER	OTHER
GEORGIA	1	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4			

Appendix Table A-13

State Requirements for Local Reporting  
On Computer Matching  
On-Going Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Must Locals Submit Report? (Q8.20)	Frequency of Local Reports (Q8.21)	Content (Q8.22)
HAWAII	1	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2	YES	OTHER	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	3	YES	OTHER	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	4			
	5			
IDAHO	1			
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	7	NO		
	8	NO		
ILLINOIS	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	7			
	8			
INDIANA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3			
	4			
	5			
IOWA	1	YES	VARIES	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
KANSAS	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4			
	5	NO		
	6			
	7	YES	VARIES	TURN AROUND DOCUMENT
KENTUCKY	8	NO		
	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
LOUISIANA	5			
	1	YES	MONTHLY	CLAIM REFERRALS
	2	YES	MONTHLY	CLAIM REFERRALS
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		

Appendix Table A-13

State Requirements for Local Reporting  
On Computer Matching  
On-Going Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Must Locals Submit Report? (Q8.20)	Frequency of Local Reports (Q8.21)	Content (Q8.22)
MAINE	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3			
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	7			
MARYLAND	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
MASSACHUSETTS	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5			
MICHIGAN	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	4	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
MINNESOTA	1	YES	QUARTER	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	3			
	4	YES	QUARTER	RESOLUTION OF HITS
MISSISSIPPI	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
MISSOURI	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	7	NO		
	8	NO		
	9	NO		
	10	NO		
	11	NO		
MONTANA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
NEBRASKA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	6			
NEVADA	1	NO		

Appendix Table A-13

State Requirements for Local Reporting  
On Computer Matching  
On-Going Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Must Locals Submit Report? (Q8.20)	Frequency of Local Reports (Q8.21)	Content (Q8.22)
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5			
NEW JERSEY	1	YES	VARIES	TURNAROUND DOCUMENT
	2	YES	VARIES	TURNAROUND DOCUMENT
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
NEW MEXICO	1	YES	VARIES	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2			
	3	YES	VARIES	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	4	YES	VARIES	RESOLUTION OF HITS
NEW YORK	1	NO		
	2	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	3			
	4			
	5	NO		
NORTH CAROLINA	1			
	2	NO		
	3			
	4			
NORTH DAKOTA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
OKLAHOMA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
OREGON	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	7	NO		
	8			
PENNSYLVANIA	1	YES	QUARTER	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
RHODE ISLAND	1	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	3	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		

## Appendix Table A-13

State Requirements for Local Reporting  
On Computer Matching  
On-Going Systems  
By State by System

State	System Number	Must Locals Submit Report? (Q8.20)	Frequency of Local Reports (Q8.21)	Content (Q8.22)
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3			
	4			
	5			
	6			
	7			
	8			
	9			
TEXAS	2			
	1	NO		
	2			
	3	NO		
UTAH	4	YES	QUARTER	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	5			
	1	NO		
	2	NO		
	3			
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
VERMONT	7	NO		
	8	NO		
	1	NO		
	2	NO		
VIRGINIA	3	NO		
	4			
	1	NO		
	2	YES	MONTHLY	RESOLUTION OF HITS
WASHINGTON	3	YES	QUARTER	TURN AROUND DOCUMENT
	4	YES	VARIES	DISQUALIFIED STATUS
	1	NO		
	2	NO		
WEST VIRGINIA	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	1	NO		
	2	NO		
WISCONSIN	3	NO		
	4	NO		
	5	NO		
	6	NO		
	7			
	1	YES	VARIES	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	2	YES	VARIES	RESOLUTION OF HITS
WYOMING	3	YES	VARIES	RESOLUTION OF HITS
	1	YES	MONTHLY	ACTION TAKEN ON HITS
	2	YES	MONTHLY	ACTION TAKEN ON HITS
GUAM	3			
	4	YES	MONTHLY	ACTION TAKEN ON HITS
	5	YES	MONTHLY	ACTION TAKEN ON HITS
VIRGIN ISLANDS	1	YES	VARIES	M.V.

## Appendix Table A-14

Sources of Data Routinely Matched  
(as of August 1986)  
(Q4.00)

STATE	DATA SOURCES ROUTINELY MATCHED							
	Wages	UI Benefit	SSA Wages	SSA Employ	SSA Benefit	SSI Benefit	State Tax	Bank Records
Alabama	X	X						
Alaska	X	X			X	X		
Arizona	X	X			X			
Arkansas	X	X				X		
California	X						X	
Colorado	X	X				X		
Connecticut	X	X			X	X		X
Delaware	X	X						
Dist. of Col.	X	X	X		X	X		
Florida	X	X				X		
Georgia	X	X			X	X		
Hawaii		X	X	X	X	X		X
Idaho	X	X			X	X		
Illinois	X	X				X	X	
Indiana	X	X			X	X		
Iowa	X	X			X			
Kansas	X	X			X			
Kentucky	X	X				X		
Louisiana	X	X			X	X		
Maine	X	X			X	X		X
Maryland	X	X			X			
Massachusetts	X	X			X	X		X
Michigan			X	X	X	X		
Minnesota	X	X						
Mississippi	X	X			X	X		
Missouri	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Montana	X	X			X			
Nebraska		X			X	X		
Nevada	X	X						
New Hampshire	X	X			X	X		
New Jersey	X	X						
New Mexico	X	X				X		
New York	X	X			X			
North Carolina	X	X			X	X		
North Dakota	X	X			X	X		
Ohio	No computer matching capabilities for Food Stamp Program							
Oklahoma	X	X			X	X		
Oregon	X	X			X	X		
Pennsylvania	X	X						
Rhode Island		X						
South Carolina	X	X				X		
South Dakota	X	X			X	X		
Tennessee	X	X			X	X		
Texas	X	X		X	X	X		
Utah	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Vermont		X	X	X	X	X		
Virginia	X	X						
Washington	X	X				X		
West Virginia	X	X						
Wisconsin		X	X		X	X		
Wyoming	X	X				X		
Guam			X		X			
Virgin Islands	X							



Appendix Table A-14

Sources of Data Routinely Matched  
(as of August 1986)  
(Q4.00)

STATE	DATA SOURCES ROUTINELY MATCHED								
	DMV	AFDC	GA	MEDI- CAID	MEDI- CARE	1099 TAX	OTHER STATE WAGE	OTHER STATE UI	OTHER STATE PA
Alabama									
Alaska									
Arizona	X								
Arkansas		X		X					
California									
Colorado		X		X					
Connecticut					X				
Delaware									
Dist. of Col.	X						X	X	X
Florida		X							
Georgia									
Hawaii	X								
Idaho									
Illinois	X								
Indiana									
Iowa									X
Kansas							X	X	X
Kentucky		X							
Louisiana		X	X	X					
Maine	X								
Maryland									
Massachusetts									
Michigan	X				X				
Minnesota									
Mississippi									
Missouri		X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Montana									
Nebraska		X							
Nevada									
New Hampshire									
New Jersey									
New Mexico		X							X
New York	X								
North Carolina	X								
North Dakota									
Ohio									
Oklahoma									
Oregon		X	X						
Pennsylvania									
Rhode Island		X							
South Carolina		X	X	X					
South Dakota									
Tennessee		X		X					
Texas									
Utah	X								
Vermont					X				
Virginia									
Washington									
West Virginia		X		X					
Wisconsin									
Wyoming		X				X			
Guam									X
Virgin Islands									

Appendix Table A-14

Sources of Data Routinely Matched  
(as of August 1986)  
(Q4.00)

STATE	DATA SOURCES ROUTINELY MATCHED							
	SSA/ SSN	Nat'l Disq.	Worker Comp.	Other Empl.	State Non- Welfare	F.S. Dupl.	Other State Assist.	Other Federal
Alabama								
Alaska	X				X			
Arizona		X						
Arkansas						X	X	
California		X						
Colorado			X					
Connecticut								
Delaware								
Dist. of Col.					X			
Florida		X			X	X	X	X
Georgia					X			
Hawaii								
Idaho	X	X			X		X	
Illinois					X		X	
Indiana	X							
Iowa								
Kansas					X	X		
Kentucky								
Louisiana								
Maine								
Maryland								
Massachusetts								
Michigan								
Minnesota	X					X		
Mississippi								
Missouri		X			X		X	
Montana			X					
Nebraska						X	X	
Nevada								
New Hampshire								
New Jersey							X	
New Mexico							X	
New York					X			
North Carolina								
North Dakota			X					
Ohio								
Oklahoma	X							
Oregon		X	X		X		X	
Pennsylvania					X			
Rhode Island				X			X	
South Carolina		X		X				
South Dakota								
Tennessee							X	
Texas						X		
Utah								X
Vermont	X							
Virginia								
Washington						X		
West Virginia			X			X		
Wisconsin	X					X		
Wyoming					X		X	
Guam		X				X		
Virgin Islands								

Appendix Table A-15

Front-end and On-going Access  
By State

State	Front-end Access? (Q6.00)	On-going Access? (Q8.00)
ALABAMA	YES	YES
ALASKA	YES	YES
ARIZONA	YES	YES
ARKANSAS	YES	YES
CALIFORNIA	YES	YES
COLORADO	YES	YES
CONNECTICUT	YES	YES
DELAWARE	YES	YES
DIST. OF COL.	YES	YES
FLORIDA	YES	YES
GEORGIA	YES	YES
HAWAII	YES	YES
IDAHO	YES	YES
ILLINOIS	YES	YES
INDIANA	YES	YES
IOWA		YES
KANSAS	YES	YES
KENTUCKY	YES	YES
LOUISIANA	YES	YES
MAINE	YES	YES
MARYLAND	YES	YES
MASSACHUSETTS	YES	YES
MICHIGAN	YES	YES
MINNESOTA	YES	YES
MISSISSIPPI	YES	YES
MISSOURI	YES	YES
MONTANA	YES	YES
NEBRASKA	YES	YES
NEVADA	YES	YES
NEW HAMPSHIRE	YES	YES
NEW JERSEY	YES	YES
NEW MEXICO	YES	YES
NEW YORK	YES	YES
NORTH CAROLINA	YES	YES
NORTH DAKOTA		YES
OKLAHOMA	YES	YES
OHIO	NO COMPUTER MATCHING FACILITIES	
OREGON	YES	YES
PENNSYLVANIA	YES	YES
RHODE ISLAND	YES	YES
SOUTH CAROLINA	YES	YES
SOUTH DAKOTA	YES	YES
TENNESSEE	YES	YES
TEXAS	YES	YES
UTAH	YES	YES
VERMONT	YES	YES
VIRGINIA	YES	YES
WASHINGTON		YES
WEST VIRGINIA	YES	YES
WISCONSIN	YES	YES
WYOMING	YES	YES
GUAM	YES	YES
VIRGIN ISLANDS		YES

Appendix Table A-16  
Front-end Cases Covered  
By State  
(Q6.03)

State	Entire Caseload	FS/AFDC	FS Employed	Worker Choice	Other
					YES
ALABAMA	YES				
ALASKA	YES			YES	
ARIZONA	YES				
ARKANSAS	YES			YES	
CALIFORNIA	YES	YES		YES	YES
COLORADO	YES				
CONNECTICUT	YES				
DELAWARE	YES				
DIST. OF COL.	YES				
FLORIDA	YES				
GEORGIA	YES				
HAWAII	YES			YES	YES
IDAHO	YES				
ILLINOIS	YES				YES
INDIANA	YES				
IOWA					
KANSAS	YES				
KENTUCKY	YES			YES	
LOUISIANA	YES				
MAINE	YES				YES
MARYLAND	YES				YES
MASSACHUSETTS	YES				
MICHIGAN	YES				
MINNESOTA	YES				
MISSISSIPPI	YES				
MISSOURI	YES				
MONTANA	YES				
NEBRASKA	YES				
NEVADA	YES				
NEW HAMPSHIRE	YES				
NEW JERSEY	YES				
NEW MEXICO	YES				
NEW YORK	YES				
NORTH CAROLINA	YES				
NORTH DAKOTA					YES
OKLAHOMA	YES				
OHIO	NO COMPUTER MATCHING FACILITIES				
OREGON	YES				
PENNSYLVANIA	YES				
RHODE ISLAND	YES				
SOUTH CAROLINA	YES				
SOUTH DAKOTA	YES				
TENNESSEE	YES				
TEXAS	YES				
UTAH	YES				
VERMONT	YES				
VIRGINIA	YES				
WASHINGTON					
WEST VIRGINIA	YES				
WISCONSIN	YES				
WYOMING	YES				
GUAM	YES				
VIRGIN ISLANDS					

Appendix Table A-17

On-going Cases Covered  
By State  
(Q8.03)

State	Entire Caseload	FS/AFDC	FS Employed	Worker Choice	Other
ALABAMA					YES
ALASKA	YES				
ARIZONA	YES			YES	
ARKANSAS	YES				
CALIFORNIA	YES			YES	
COLORADO	YES				YES
CONNECTICUT	YES			YES	
DELAWARE	YES				
DIST. OF COL.	YES				
FLORIDA	YES	YES			
GEORGIA	YES				
HAWAII	YES				YES
IDAHO	YES			YES	YES
ILLINOIS	YES				YES
INDIANA	YES				
IOWA	YES				
KANSAS	YES				YES
KENTUCKY	YES				
LOUISIANA	YES				YES
MAINE	YES				
MARYLAND	YES				YES
MASSACHUSETTS	YES				YES
MICHIGAN	YES				
MINNESOTA					YES
MISSISSIPPI	YES				YES
MISSOURI	YES				
MONTANA	YES				
NEBRASKA	YES				
NEVADA	YES				
NEW HAMPSHIRE	YES				
NEW JERSEY	YES				
NEW MEXICO	YES				YES
NEW YORK	YES			YES	
NORTH CAROLINA	YES				
NORTH DAKOTA	YES				
OKLAHOMA	YES	YES			
OHIO	NO COMPUTER MATCHING FACILITIES				
OREGON	YES				
PENNSYLVANIA	YES				
RHODE ISLAND	YES	YES			
SOUTH CAROLINA	YES				
SOUTH DAKOTA	YES				
TENNESSEE	YES				
TEXAS	YES				
UTAH	YES				
VERMONT	YES				
VIRGINIA	YES				
WASHINGTON	YES	YES			
WEST VIRGINIA	YES				
WISCONSIN	YES				
WYOMING	YES				
GUAM	YES				
VIRGIN ISLANDS	YES				

Appendix Table A-18

SPECIAL MATCHING BY TYPE OF  
MATCH AND BY STATE

	NEIGHBORING JURISDICTION- PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	NEIGHBORING JURISDICTION- EARNED INCOME	ASSET MATCH	SSN VALIDATION	FEDERAL FILE	FNS- REGIONAL MATCH	INTRA- STATE	NO SPECIAL MATCHING
ALABAMA								XXXX
ALASKA								XXXX
ARIZONA				XXXX				
ARKANSAS								XXXX
CALIFORNIA		XXXX			XXXX		XXXX	
COLORADO								XXXX
CONNECTICUT								XXXX
DELAWARE			XXXX				XXXX	
D.C.		XXXX						
FLORIDA						XXXX	XXXX	
GEORGIA						XXXX		
HAWAII								XXXX
IDAHO	XXXX							
INDIANA	XXXX							
ILLINOIS	XXXX		XXXX				XXXX	
IOWA								XXXX
KANSAS	XXXX			XXXX				
KENTUCKY						XXXX		
LOUISIANA								XXXX
MAINE								XXXX

Appendix Table A-18

SPECIAL MATCHING BY TYPE OF  
MATCH AND BY STATE

	NEIGHBORING JURISDICTION- PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	NEIGHBORING JURISDICTION- EARNED INCOME	ASSET MATCH	SSN VALIDATION	FEDERAL FILE	FNS- REGIONAL MATCH	INTRA- STATE	NO SPECIAL MATCHING
MARYLAND		XXXX	XXXX					
MASSACHUSETTS								XXXX
MICHIGAN			XXXX				XXXX	
MINNESOTA								XXXX
MISSOURI	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX				XXXX	
MISSISSIPPI						XXXX		
MONTANA								XXXX
NEBRASKA								XXXX
NEVADA	XXXX							
NEW HAMPSHIRE	XXXX							
NEW JERSEY	XXXX	XXXX						
NEW MEXICO								XXXX
NEW YORK	XXXX		XXXX		XXXX		XXXX	
NORTH CAROLINA	XXXX	XXXX					XXXX	
NORTH DAKOTA								XXXX
OHIO					XXXX			
OKLAHOMA					XXXX			
OREGON								XXXX
PENNSYLVANIA	XXXX		XXXX		XXXX		XXXX	
RHODE ISLAND					XXXX			

Appendix Table A-18

SPECIAL MATCHING BY TYPE OF  
MATCH AND BY STATE

	NEIGHBORING JURISDICTION- PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	NEIGHBORING JURISDICTION- EARNED INCOME	ASSET MATCH	SSN VALIDATION	FEDERAL FILE	FNS- REGIONAL MATCH	INTRA- STATE	NO SPECIAL MATCHING
SOUTH CAROLINA						XXXX		
SOUTH DAKOTA								XXXX
TENNESSEE								XXXX
TEXAS	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX		XXXX		XXXX	
UTAH								XXXX
VERMONT	XXXX							
VIRGINIA								XXXX
WASHINGTON								XXXX
WEST VIRGINIA	XXXX	XXXX						
WISCONSIN	XXXX	XXXX						
WYOMING					XXXX			
GUAM								XXXX
VIRGIN ISLANDS								XXXX





APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF MATERIALS SUBMITTED BY STATES  
ON COMPUTER MATCHING



## APPENDIX B

### State Materials on Computer Matching

<u>State</u>	<u>Description of Materials Provided</u>
ALABAMA	Policies and procedures for the Wage/UCB match with the Department of Industrial Relations' files.
ALASKA	Description of computer system for client data discrepancy alerts (system functions and capabilities). Question and answer training memoranda from the Program Manager to Eligibility Staff.
ARIZONA	Pages from policy manual on procedures for performing wage, UI, and Bendex matches.
CALIFORNIA	Description of the Welfare Fraud Program which includes the Integrated Earnings Clearance/Fraud Detection System, the Asset Clearance Match and several miscellaneous matches.
COLORADO	Description, intent and operating procedures of the wage match.
DELAWARE	Procedures for follow-up (time limits, initial screening, investigations, and case disposition).
D.C.	Procedures and flow chart for wage, UCB suspense system.
FLORIDA	Policies, procedures, and reporting requirements for the Income Verification System which matches against several different data bases. Some outcome data is provided from the name duplication match.
GEORGIA	Relevant pages from PARIS Eligibility Worker's User Manual pertaining to wage match, UCB match and SDX matching.
HAWAII	Some UCB quarterly outcome information, description of the bank match including a copy of a bill enacted by the Hawaii State legislature requiring financial institutions to furnish the records of accounts, deposits and withdrawals of any applicant for or recipient of public assistance, relevant portions of the policy manual on wage matching.
ILLINOIS	Policies and procedures, a listing of special matching activities and a data exchange cost-effectiveness report prepared by the Management Analysis Section and the Bureau of Research and Analysis. Local office results of certain data exchange activities is also included.

## APPENDIX B

### State Materials on Computer Matching

<u>State</u>	<u>Description of Materials Provided</u>
IOWA	Interoffice memos and report forms for the wage, UI and Bendex matches. A description of the automated systems and each of the mainframe application used in the state are also included.
INDIANA	Interdepartmental billing for data processing services from the Employment Security Division to be paid for by the Department of Public Welfare.
KANSAS	Description of computer match systems in use in that state as well as general personnel and data processing costs for each system.
KENTUCKY	Portions of Food Stamp Handbook on 'Required Verification at Application' describing the certification and verification process for Food Stamp applicants.
MAINE	AFDC/Food Stamp Terminal Operator's Guide, from the Maine Department of Human Services, Division of Data Processing.
MARYLAND	Copy of the inquiry form used by workers to request matching information.
MASSACHUSETTS	Food Stamp Procedural memo on computer matching with instructions for eligibility worker with regard to each of the computer matching systems.
MICHIGAN	Result information on SSA wage match as of November 1985. Michigan also provided a report on the local office expansion project for local offices.
MISSISSIPPI	Reporting forms, instructions and descriptions of matching systems in the state.
MISSOURI	Bendex portion of the Federal/State Data Exchange Handbook, portions of the Food Stamp Manual, instructions and coding relating especially to the Employment Security Interface match.
NEW MEXICO	Copies of several matching reports on duplicate participation, some data processing cost information, portions of the manual relating to pre-interview computer requirements and description of restrictions on the use of Employment Security Department wage data.

## APPENDIX B

### State Materials on Computer Matching

<u>State</u>	<u>Description of Materials Provided</u>
NEW YORK	Worker reference manual on the Resource File Integration (RFI) system, Annual Report on the Wage Reporting System (for February 1985 and February 1986), portions of the Food Stamp manual on the use of SDX/Bendex for verification, Procedures manual for the CRT Inquiry Terminal and employer forms for the New York State wage reporting System (with the New York State Department of Taxation and Revenue).
NORTH CAROLINA	Eligibility Information System User's Manual and Department of Social Services Administrative Letters on wage match procedures.
OKLAHOMA	State Data Exchange Handbook for use of Bendex, SDX, Employment Security Commission wage and UI matches and verification and enumeration procedures with the Social Security Administration.
PENNSYLVANIA	Quarterly wage match report and statistics, wage and state employee procedures, copy of an agreement with New Jersey on a neighboring jurisdiction match, and a description of the lottery match.
SOUTH CAROLINA	Section of Food Stamp Program Policy and Procedure Manual on application procedures for initial certification, description of the Food Stamp wage match, unemployment compensation, QC reports on several of the matches and copies of some terminal screens.
TENNESSEE	Update on procedures for processing wage match information at recertification.
UTAH	Manual instructions on the wage match with the Employment Security Commission and copies of inquiry screens and instructions for several of the matches.
VERMONT	Descriptions of existing Vermont matches and procedures for SDX and Bendex matches.
WISCONSIN	Memo on rationale and usage for the monthly unemployment compensation match.
WYOMING	General system parameters for Payee Analysis and Intercept System (PAS), wage discrepancy reports and instructions, screen summaries for on-line information, and update instructions, all under PAS.
VIRGIN ISLANDS	Memorandum on the implementation of wage matching in the Virgin Islands.



**APPENDIX C**  
**COPY OF COMPUTER MATCHING SURVEY INSTRUMENT**





COMPUTER MATCHING  
STATE CENSUS INSTRUMENT

## MODULE 1: IDENTIFICATION OF SYSTEMS

1.00 INTRODUCTION: I would like to ask you some questions about various processes used in this state for matching information about food stamp clients with information from external data bases. First I want to identify all the matching systems used in the past two years. I will ask first about routine computerized match systems, then about any special one-time matches and non-computerized processes.

1.01 Are there any routine automated batch systems used for matching to validate or investigate information on food stamp clients?

YES.....1

NO.....(GO TO 1.03).....0

1.02 Please name all the batch match systems that are used routinely.

BATCH SYSTEM 1 \_\_\_\_\_

BATCH SYSTEM 2 \_\_\_\_\_

BATCH SYSTEM 3 \_\_\_\_\_

BATCH SYSTEM 4 \_\_\_\_\_

1.03 Are there any routine on-line computer matching systems used by staff to validate or investigate information on food stamp clients?

YES.....1

NO.....(GO TO 1.05).....0

1.04 Please name all the on-line match systems  
that are used routinely.

ON-LINE SYSTEM 1 \_\_\_\_\_  
ON-LINE SYSTEM 2 \_\_\_\_\_  
ON-LINE SYSTEM 3 \_\_\_\_\_  
ON-LINE SYSTEM 4 \_\_\_\_\_

1.05 Are there any other routine computer  
matching systems used in the past two  
years in the state for food stamp clients,  
other than the ones you have already  
mentioned?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO 1.07).....0

1.06 Please briefly describe these other computer  
match systems.

OTHER COMPUTER SYSTEM 1 (NARRATIVE) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

STATUS: ROUTINE AUTOMATED  
MATCH.....1

ROUTINE AUTOMATED ONLINE.....12  
OTHER 3  
(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER COMPUTER SYSTEM 2 (NARRATIVE) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

STATUS: ROUTINE AUTOMATED  
MATCH.....1

ROUTINE AUTOMATED ONLINE.....2  
OTHER.....1  
(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

1.07 Has this state performed any one-time only  
or special computer matches in the past two  
years on food stamp clients either with data  
bases in this state or with other states?

YES.....1

NO.....(GO TO 1.09).....0

1.08 Could you briefly tell me about the special  
computer matches?

	WHEN	
	NO	YR
SPECIAL MATCH 1		
SPECIAL MATCH 2		
SPECIAL MATCH 3		
SPECIAL MATCH 4		
SPECIAL MATCH 5		
SPECIAL MATCH 6		

1.09 Are there any routine or special non-automated  
systems used in the past two years in this  
state for matching information on food stamp  
clients?

YES.....1

NO.....(GO TO 1.11).....0

1.10 Briefly describe the non-automated match  
processes.

NONCOMPUTER SYSTEM 1 \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
NONCOMPUTER SYSTEM 2 \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

1.11 We have probably covered every possible  
kind of match system used, but are there  
any others we may have missed?

YES.....1

NO.....(GO TO 1.12).....0

1.12 Please describe the others.

OTHER SYSTEM 1 \_\_\_\_\_

STATUS: ROUTINE AUTOMATED  
BATCH.....1

ROUTINE AUTOMATED ONLINE.....2

OTHER.....3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER SYSTEM 2 \_\_\_\_\_

STATUS: ROUTINE AUTOMATED  
BATCH.....1

ROUTINE AUTOMATED ONLINE.....2

OTHER.....3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

1.13 Now, let's summarize the different routine computer matching systems you've mentioned. NOTE: BASED ON RESPONSES TO 1.01-1.12, LIST ALL THE DIFFERENT ROUTINE COMPUTER MATCH SYSTEMS IN THIS STATE.

NAME/DESCRIPTOR

SYSTEM 1: \_\_\_\_\_  
SYSTEM 2: \_\_\_\_\_  
SYSTEM 3: \_\_\_\_\_  
SYSTEM 4: \_\_\_\_\_  
SYSTEM 5: \_\_\_\_\_  
SYSTEM 6: \_\_\_\_\_

NOTES:

For each routine computer match system we have identified, I would like to ask you some additional questions. NOTE: FOR EACH ROUTINE COMPUTER MATCH SYSTEM IDENTIFIED, COMPLETE MODULES 2 THROUGH 9. IF ADDITIONAL SYSTEMS ARE IDENTIFIED IN THE COURSE OF THE INTERVIEW, ADD THEM TO THE LIST IN 1.13.

# MODULE 2: GENERAL SYSTEM INFORMATION

		First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
2.00	IDENTIFY SYSTEM .....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2.01	Is this match system used for the whole state or food stamps?						
	YES.....(GO TO 2.03).....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
	NO.....	...2...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
2.02	What parts of the state are covered by this match system for food stamps? NARRATIVE.						
2.03	Must welfare or public assistance programs use this computer match system? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO
	FOOD STAMPS.....	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...
	AFDC.....	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...
	MEDICAID.....	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...
	CHILD SUPPORT.....	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...
	OTHER.....	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...	...1 0...
	(SPECIFY).....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
2.04 What is the name of the office that has responsibility for this computer match system? RECORD OFFICE, AGENCY, AND DEPARTMENT.						
2.05 In what month and year was this computer match system first fully operational for food stamps?						
MONTH.....	__	__	__	__	__	__
YEAR.....	19__	19__	19__	19__	19__	19__
2.06 In what month and year did the design, development and testing period for this match system begin?						
MONTH.....	__	__	__	__	__	__
YEAR.....	19__	19__	19__	19__	19__	19__
2.07 Was a separate testing or design phase required for including food stamps in this match system?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GU TO 3.00).....	...2...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
2.08 In what month and year did the food stamp design, development and testing period for this system begin?						
MONTH.....	__	__	__	__	__	__
YEAR.....	19__	19__	19__	19__	19__	19__



### MODULE 3: COMPUTER MATCHING COSTS

The next set of questions concerns the costs of the computer matching system. Some of the questions may concern costs that have been measured in analyses the state has done. If so, we would like to have both the answer to the question and a copy of the analysis, if that can be made available. Please provide a best estimate if actual costs are not available.

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
3.01 Is there any information on the going costs of this matching system?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 4.00).....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...

NOTES ON SYSTEM 1:

NOTES ON SYSTEM 2:

NOTES ON SYSTEM 3:

NOTES ON SYSTEM 4:

NOTES ON SYSTEM 5:

NOTES ON SYSTEM 6:

# FIRST SYSTEM

3.02.01 If you have these costs summarized as "cost per case per month," please provide them in that way. By "cost per case per month," we mean the average total costs for cases put through the match process. If costs are not summarized as "cost per case per month," provide them in whatever form in which you maintain them. Please provide separate cost figures for each of the following cost elements, and for each indicate whether the figure comes from a formal study or is a professional estimate. Remember that the figures should only include the costs of carrying out functions related to computer matching.

COST ELEMENT	COST/CASE /MONTH	OTHER COST METRIC: (SPECIFY BELOW)	FROM PROF. STUDY	ESTIMATE
<u>PERSONNEL</u>				
<u>THOUSANDS</u>				
ELIGIBILITY WORKERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
DATA ENTRY WORKERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
DATA PROCESSING/PROGRAMMERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER WORKER: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER WORKER: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
FRINGE BENEFITS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
<u>OTHER DIRECT</u>				
DATA PROCESSING.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
MAILING/POSTAGE.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
<u>INDIRECT</u>				
INDIRECT COST: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
INDIRECT COST: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
INDIRECT COST: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
TOTAL COST:.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2

# SECOND SYSTEM

3.02.02 If you have these costs summarized as "cost per case per month," please provide them in that way. By "cost per case per month," we mean the average total costs for cases put through the match process. If costs are not summarized as "cost per case per month," provide them in whatever form in which you maintain them. Please provide separate cost figures for each of the following cost elements, and for each indicate whether the figure comes from a formal study or is a professional estimate. Remember that the figures should only include the costs of carrying out functions related to computer matching.

COST ELEMENT	COST/CASE /MONTH	OTHER COST METRIC: (SPECIFY BELOW)	FROM PROF. STUDY	ESTIMATE
<u>PERSONNEL</u>				
<u>THOUSANDS</u>				
ELIGIBILITY WORKERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
DATA ENTRY WORKERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
DATA PROCESSING/PROGRAMMERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER WORKER: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER WORKER: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
FRINGE BENEFITS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
<u>OTHER DIRECT</u>				
DATA PROCESSING.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
MAILING/POSTAGE.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
<u>INDIRECT</u>				
INDIRECT COST: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
INDIRECT COST: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
INDIRECT COST: [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
TOTAL COST:.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2

## THIRD SYSTEM

3.02.03 If you have these costs summarized as "cost per case per month," please provide them in that way. By "cost per case per month," we mean the average total costs for cases put through the match process. If costs are not summarized as "cost per case per month," provide them in whatever form in which you maintain them. Please provide separate cost figures for each of the following costs elements, and for each indicate whether the figure comes from a formal study or is a professional estimate. Remember that the figures should only include the costs of carrying out functions related to computer matching.

COST ELEMENT	COST/CASE /MONTH	OTHER COST METRIC: (SPECIFY BELOW)	FROM STUDY	PROF. ESTIMATE
<u>PERSONNEL</u>				
<u>THOUSANDS</u>				
ELIGIBILITY WORKERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
DATA ENTRY WORKERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
DATA PROCESSING/PROGRAMMERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER WORKER: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER WORKER: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
FRINGE BENEFITS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
<u>OTHER DIRECT</u>				
DATA PROCESSING.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
MAILING/POSTAGE.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
<u>INDIRECT</u>				
INDIRECT COST: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
INDIRECT COST: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
INDIRECT COST: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
TOTAL COST:.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2

## FOURTH SYSTEM

3.02.04 If you have these costs summarized as "cost per case per month," please provide them in that way. By "cost per case per month," we mean the average total costs for cases put through the match process. If costs are not summarized as "cost per case per month," provide them in whatever form in which you maintain them. Please provide separate cost figures for each of the following costs elements, and for each indicate whether the figure comes from a formal study or is a professional estimate. Remember that the figures should only include the costs of carrying out functions related to computer matching.

COST ELEMENT	COST/CASE /MONTH	OTHER COST METRIC: (SPECIFY BELOW)	FROM STUDY	PROF. ESTIMATE
<u>PERSONNEL</u>				
<u>THOUSANDS</u>				
ELIGIBILITY WORKERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
DATA ENTRY WORKERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
DATA PROCESSING/PROGRAMMERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER WORKER: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER WORKER: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
FRINGE BENEFITS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
<u>OTHER DIRECT</u>				
DATA PROCESSING.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
MAILING/POSTAGE.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
<u>INDIRECT</u>				
INDIRECT COST: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
INDIRECT COST: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
INDIRECT COST: _____	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2
TOTAL COST:.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2

## FIFTH SYSTEM

3.02.05 If you have these costs summarized as "cost per case per month," please provide them in that way. By "cost per case per month," we mean the average total costs for cases put through the match process. If costs are not summarized as "cost per case per month," provide them in whatever form in which you maintain them. Please provide separate cost figures for each of the following costs elements, and for each indicate whether the figure comes from a formal study or is a professional estimate. Remember that the figures should only include the costs of carrying out functions related to computer matching.

COST ELEMENT	COST/CASE /MONTH	OTHER COST METRIC: (SPECIFY BELOW)	FROM	PROF. STUDY	ESTIMATE
<u>PERSONNEL</u>					
<u>THOUSANDS</u>					
ELIGIBILITY WORKERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
DATA ENTRY WORKERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
DATA PROCESSING/PROGRAMMERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
OTHER WORKER: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
OTHER WORKER: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
FRINGE BENEFITS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
<u>OTHER DIRECT</u>					
DATA PROCESSING.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
MAILING/POSTAGE.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
OTHER NON-LABOR: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
OTHER NON-LABOR: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
OTHER NON-LABOR: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
<u>INDIRECT</u>					
INDIRECT COST: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
INDIRECT COST: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
INDIRECT COST: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
TOTAL COST: .....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	

METRIC-COST/

## SIXTH SYSTEM

3.02.06 If you have these costs summarized as "cost per case per month," please provide them in that way. By "cost per case per month," we mean the average total costs for cases put through the match process. If costs are not summarized as "cost per case per month," provide them in whatever form in which you maintain them. Please provide separate cost figures for each of the following costs elements, and for each indicate whether the figure comes from a formal study or is a professional estimate. Remember that the figures should only include the costs of carrying out functions related to computer matching.

COST ELEMENT	COST/CASE /MONTH	OTHER COST METRIC: (SPECIFY BELOW)	FROM	PROF. STUDY	ESTIMATE
<u>PERSONNEL</u>					
<u>THOUSANDS</u>					
ELIGIBILITY WORKERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
DATA ENTRY WORKERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
DATA PROCESSING/PROGRAMMERS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
OTHER WORKER: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
OTHER WORKER: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
FRINGE BENEFITS.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
<u>OTHER DIRECT</u>					
DATA PROCESSING.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
MAILING/POSTAGE.....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
OTHER NON-LABOR: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
OTHER NON-LABOR: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
OTHER NON-LABOR: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
<u>INDIRECT</u>					
INDIRECT COST: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
INDIRECT COST: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
INDIRECT COST: _____ [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	
TOTAL COST: .....	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ]	\$ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	1	2	

# MODULE 4: DATA BASES

## FIRST SYSTEM

The next questions are about the data bases used in the computer matching system.

4.00 Which data bases are accessed by this system? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.) INTERVIEWER NOTE: FOR EACH DATA BASE ACCESSED, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS (4.01-4.03).

4.01 How often is the (NAME) data base updated? (UPDATE MEANS HOW OFTEN THE INFORMATION IN THE DATA BASE IS REVISED OR CHANGED.)

4.02 How much time elapses between the end of the time period covered by the data base and the availability of the data for matching?

4.03 In what month and year was this data base added to the computer match system?

DATA BASES	4.00 ACCESSED?	4.01 UPDATE?					4.02 TIME LAPSE								4.03 DATE ADDED
		DA	WK.	MO.	QT.	AN.	next	next	2-3	1-3		4-6	7-9	10-12	>12
							day	wk	wks	mos	mos	mos	mos	mos	
a. DEN wages	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
b. UI benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
c. SSA wages	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
e. SSA benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
f. SSI benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
g. State tax files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
j. DMV records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 15 <input type="text"/>
k. AFDC files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>

C-12

m. Medicaid records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
n. Medicare records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY) <input type="text"/>	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
q. Other (SPECIFY) <input type="text"/>	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
r. Other (SPECIFY) <input type="text"/>	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>

# MODULE 4: DATA BASES

## SECOND SYSTEM

The next questions are about the data bases used in the computer matching system.

4.00 Which data bases are accessed by this system? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.) INTERVIEWER NOTE: FOR EACH DATA BASE ACCESSED, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS (4.01-4.03).

4.01 How often is the (NAME) data base updated? (UPDATE MEANS HOW OFTEN THE INFORMATION IN THE DATA BASE IS REVISED OR CHANGED.)

4.02 How much time elapses between the end of the time period covered by the data base and the availability of the data for matching?

4.03 In what month and year was this data base added to the computer match system?

DATA BASES	4.00 ACCESSED?	4.01 UPDATE?					4.02 TIME LAPSE								4.03 DATE ADDED
		DA	WK.	MO.	QT.	AN.	next day	next wk	2-3 wks	1-3 mos	4-6 mos	7-9 mos	10-12 mos	>12 mos	
a. ORE wages	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
b. UI benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
c. SSA wages	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
e. SSA benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
f. SSI benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
g. State tax files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
j. DMV records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
k. APDC files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
m. Medicaid records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
n. Medicare records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY) <input type="text"/>	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
q. Other (SPECIFY) <input type="text"/>	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
r. Other (SPECIFY) <input type="text"/>	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>

# MODULE 4: DATA BASES

## THIRD SYSTEM

The next questions are about the data bases used in the computer matching system.

4.00 Which data bases are accessed by this system? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.) INTERVIEWER NOTE: FOR EACH DATA BASE ACCESSED, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS (4.01-4.03).

4.01 How often is the (NAME) data base updated? (UPDATE MEANS HOW OFTEN THE INFORMATION IN THE DATA BASE IS REVISED OR CHANGED.)

4.02 How much time elapses between the end of the time period covered by the data base and the availability of the data for matching?

4.03 In what month and year was this data base added to the computer match system?

DATA BASES	4.00 ACCESSED?	4.01 UPDATE?					4.02 TIME LAPSE								4.03 DATE ADDED
		DA	WK.	MO.	QT.	AN.	next day	next wk	2-3 wks	1-3 mos	4-6 mos	7-9 mos	10-12 mos	>12 mos	
a. DES wages	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
b. UI benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
c. SSA wages	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
e. SSA benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
f. SSI benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
g. State tax files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
j. DMV records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
k. AFDC files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
m. Medicaid records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
n. Medicare records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY) _____	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
q. Other (SPECIFY) _____	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
r. Other (SPECIFY) _____	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>

# MODULE 4: DATA BASES

## FOURTH SYSTEM

The next questions are about the data bases used in the computer matching system.

4.00 Which data bases are accessed by this system? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.) INTERVIEWER NOTE: FOR EACH DATA BASE ACCESSED, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS (4.01-4.03).

4.01 How often is the (NAME) data base updated? (UPDATE MEANS HOW OFTEN THE INFORMATION IN THE DATA BASE IS REVISED OR CHANGED.)

4.02 How much time elapses between the end of the time period covered by the data base and the availability of the data for matching?

4.03 In what month and year was this data base added to the computer match system?

DATA BASES	4.00 ACCESSED?	4.01 UPDATE?					4.02 TIME LAPSE								4.03 DATE ADDED
		DA	WK.	MO.	QT.	AN.	nxt day	nxt wk	2-3 wks	1-3 mos	4-6 mos	7-9 mos	10-12 mos	>12 mos	
a. DES wages	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
b. UI benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
c. SSA wages	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
e. SSA benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
f. SSI benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
g. State tax files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
j. DMV records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
k. AFDC files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
m. Medicaid records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
n. Medicare records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY) _____	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
q. Other (SPECIFY) _____	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
r. Other (SPECIFY) _____	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>



# MODULE 4: DATA BASES

## FIFTH SYSTEM

The next questions are about the data bases used in the computer matching system.

4.00 Which data bases are accessed by this system? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.) INTERVIEWER NOTE: FOR EACH DATA BASE ACCESSED, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS (4.01-4.03).

4.01 How often is the (NAME) data base updated? (UPDATE MEANS HOW OFTEN THE INFORMATION IN THE DATA BASE IS REVISED OR CHANGED.)

4.02 How much time elapses between the end of the time period covered by the data base and the availability of the data for matching?

4.03 In what month and year was this data base added to the computer match system?

DATA BASES	4.00 ACCESSED?	4.01 UPDATE?					4.02 TIME LAPSE							4.03 DATE ADDED		
		DA	WK.	MO.	QT.	AN.	next day	next wk	2-3 wks	1-3 mos	4-6 mos	7-9 mos	10-12 mos	>12 mos	MONTH	YEAR
a. DES wages	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
b. UI benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
c. SSA wages	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
e. SBA benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
f. SSI benefits	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
g. State tax files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
j. DMV records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
k. AFDC files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
m. Medicaid records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
n. Medicare records	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY) _____	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19
q. Other (SPECIFY) _____	1	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MONTH	YEAR - 19

# MODULE 4: DATA BASES

## SIXTH SYSTEM

The next questions are about the data bases used in the computer matching system.

4.00 Which data bases are accessed by this system? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.) INTERVIEWER NOTE: FOR EACH DATA BASE ACCESSED, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS (4.01-4.03).

4.01 How often is the (NAME) data base updated? (UPDATE MEANS HOW OFTEN THE INFORMATION IN THE DATA BASE IS REVISED OR CHANGED.)

4.02 How much time elapses between the end of the time period covered by the data base and the availability of the data for matching?

4.03 In what month and year was this data base added to the computer match system?

DATA BASES	4.00 ACCESSED?	4.01 UPDATE?					4.02 TIME LAPSE								4.03 DATE ADDED	
		DA	WK.	MO.	QT.	AN.	next day	next wk	2-3 wks	1-3						>12 mos
										1-3 mos	4-6 mos	7-9 mos	10-12 mos			
a. DES wages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
b. UI benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
c. SSA wages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
d. SSA self-employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
e. SSA benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
f. SSI benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
g. State tax files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
h. Bank records - accounts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
i. Bank records - transactions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
j. DMV records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
k. AFDC files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
l. Adult general assistance files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
m. Medicaid records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
n. Medicare records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
o. IRS 1099s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
q. Other (SPECIFY) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>
r. Other (SPECIFY) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MONTH <input type="text"/> YEAR - 19 <input type="text"/>

MODULE 5: SYSTEM ACCESS AND CASE IDENTIFIER

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
5.00 What type of access is used for performing the match for this system?						
ONLINE.....(GO TO 6.00)...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
BATCH.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
5.01 Do state or local staff or both access this system for matching food stamp clients?						
STATE STAFF.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
LOCAL STAFF.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
BOTH.....	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
5.02 How long does it take for results to come back after a batch of households is run through this match system?						
IMMEDIATELY.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
LATER IN DAY.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
OVERNIGHT.....	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
LONGER.....	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...
(SPECIFY).....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□
5.03 Are the data bases on this match system integrated in the sense that one set of identifiers or characteristics accesses all information from all data bases at the same time?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...

C-18

## FIRST SYSTEM

3.04.01 What client characteristics or identifiers are used to match each data base in this match system? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

DATA BASES	ACCESSED	SSN	NAME	CASE NO.	OTHER 1 (SPECIFY BELOW)	OTHER 2 (SPECIFY BELOW)	OTHER 3 (SPECIFY BELOW)
a. DES wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
b. UI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
c. SSA wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
e. SSA benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
f. SSI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
g. State tax files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
j. DMV records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
k. AFDC files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
m. Medicaid records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
n. Medicare records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
q. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
r. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

OTHER 1: \_\_\_\_\_  
OTHER 2: \_\_\_\_\_  
OTHER 3: \_\_\_\_\_

## SECOND SYSTEM

3.04.02 What client characteristics or identifiers are used to match each data base in this match system? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

DATA BASES	ACCESSED	SSN	NAME	CASE NO.	OTHER 1 (SPECIFY BELOW)	OTHER 2 (SPECIFY BELOW)	OTHER 3 (SPECIFY BELOW)
a. DES wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
b. UI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
c. SSA wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
e. SSA benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
f. SSI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
g. State tax files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
j. DMV records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
k. AFDC files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
m. Medicaid records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
n. Medicare records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
q. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
r. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

OTHER 1: \_\_\_\_\_  
OTHER 2: \_\_\_\_\_  
OTHER 3: \_\_\_\_\_

## THIRD SYSTEM

9.01 B What client characteristics or identifiers are used to match each data base in this match system? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

DATA BASES	ACCESSED	SSN	NAME	CASE NO.	OTHER 1 (SPECIFY BELOW)	OTHER 2 (SPECIFY BELOW)	OTHER 3 (SPECIFY BELOW)
a. DES wages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. UI benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. SSA wages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. SSA self-employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. SSI benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. SSI benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. State tax files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Bank records - accounts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Bank records - transactions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. DRY records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. AFDC files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Adult general assistance files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Medicaid records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Medicare records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. IRS 1099s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____							
q. Other (SPECIFY)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____							
r. Other (SPECIFY)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____							

OTHER 1: \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER 2: \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER 3: \_\_\_\_\_

## FOURTH SYSTEM

9.01 D What client characteristics or identifiers are used to match each data base in this match system? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

DATA BASES	ACCESSED	SSN	NAME	CASE NO.	OTHER 1 (SPECIFY BELOW)	OTHER 2 (SPECIFY BELOW)	OTHER 3 (SPECIFY BELOW)
a. DES wages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. UI benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. SSA wages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. SSA self-employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. SSA benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. SSI benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. State tax files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Bank records - accounts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Bank records - transactions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. DRY records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. AFDC files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Adult general assistance files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Medicaid records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Medicare records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. IRS 1099s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____							
q. Other (SPECIFY)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____							
r. Other (SPECIFY)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____							

OTHER 1: \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER 2: \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER 3: \_\_\_\_\_

## FIFTH SYSTEM

5.01.07 What client characteristics or identifiers are used to match each data base in this match system? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

DATA BASES	ACCESSED	SSN	NAME	CASE NO.	OTHER 1 (SPECIFY BELOW)	OTHER 2 (SPECIFY BELOW)	OTHER 3 (SPECIFY BELOW)
a. DES wages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. UI benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. SSA wages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. SSA self-employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. SSA benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. SSI benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. State tax files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Bank records - accounts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Bank records - transactions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. DMV records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. AFDC files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Adult general assistance files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Medicaid records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Medicare records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____							
q. Other (SPECIFY)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____							
r. Other (SPECIFY)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____							

OTHER 1: \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER 2: \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER 3: \_\_\_\_\_

## SIXTH SYSTEM

5.01.08 What client characteristics or identifiers are used to match each data base in this match system? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

DATA BASES	ACCESSED	SSN	NAME	CASE NO.	OTHER 1 (SPECIFY BELOW)	OTHER 2 (SPECIFY BELOW)	OTHER 3 (SPECIFY BELOW)
a. DES wages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. UI benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. SSA wages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. SSA self-employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. SSA benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. SSI benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. State tax files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Bank records - accounts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Bank records - transactions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. DMV records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. AFDC files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Adult general assistance files	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Medicaid records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Medicare records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____							
q. Other (SPECIFY)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____							
r. Other (SPECIFY)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____							

OTHER 1: \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER 2: \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER 3: \_\_\_\_\_

# MODULE 6: FRONT-END MATCHING

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
6.00 Is this match system used to conduct front-end matches on food stamp applicants before certification?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(00 TO 8.00).....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
6.01 In what month and year was this match system first used for front-end matching?						
MONTH.....						
YEAR.....	19	19	19	19	19	19
6.02 What parts of the state are covered by this system for front-end matching of food stamp applicants?						
STATEWIDE.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
PART STATE ONLY.....	...2...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
(SPECIFY).....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.03 What types of food stamp cases are covered by this system for front-end matching?						
ENTIRE CASELOAD.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
FOOD STAMP/AFDC CASES.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
FOOD STAMP EMPLOYED CASES.....	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
OTHER.....	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...
(SPECIFY).....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

## FIRST SYSTEM

6.05.1 For each data base (AS LISTED IN 4.00) accessed by this system for front-and matching, what information is reviewed?

DATA BASE	ACCESSED	TYPE OF INFORMATION							
		GROSS WAGES	INCOME	BENEFITS	PROPERTY VALUE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	OTHER	
a. DES wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
b. UI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
c. SSA wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
e. SSA benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
f. SSI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
g. State tax files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
j. DRF records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
k. AFIC files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
m. Medicaid records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
n. Medicare records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]									
q. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]									
r. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]									

## SECOND SYSTEM

6.05.2 For each data base (AS LISTED IN 4.00) accessed by this system for front-and matching, what information is reviewed?

DATA BASE	ACCESSED	TYPE OF INFORMATION							
		GROSS WAGES	INCOME	BENEFITS	PROPERTY VALUE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	OTHER	
a. DES wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
b. UI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
c. SSA wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
e. SSA benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
f. SSI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
g. State tax files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
j. DRF records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
k. AFIC files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
m. Medicaid records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
n. Medicare records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]									
q. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]									
r. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]									



## THIRD SYSTEM

6.01.08 For each data base (AS LISTED IN 4.00) accessed by this system for front-end matching, what information is reviewed?

DATA BASE	ACCESSED	TYPE OF INFORMATION						
		GROSS WAGES	INCOME	BENEFITS	PROPERTY VALUE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	OTHER
a. DES wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
b. UI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
c. SSA wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
e. SSA benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
f. SSI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
g. State tax files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
j. DMV records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
k. AFDC files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
m. Medicaid records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
n. Medicare records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
p. Record from other states (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1. 1								
q. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1. 1								
r. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1. 1								

## FOURTH SYSTEM

6.01.08 For each data base (AS LISTED IN 4.00) accessed by this system for front-end matching, what information is reviewed?

DATA BASE	ACCESSED	TYPE OF INFORMATION						
		GROSS WAGES	INCOME	BENEFITS	PROPERTY VALUE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	OTHER
a. DES wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
b. UI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
c. SSA wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
e. SSA benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
f. SSI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
g. State tax files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
j. DMV records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
k. AFDC files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
m. Medicaid records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
n. Medicare records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1. 1					1			
q. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1. 1								
r. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1. 1								

## FIFTH SYSTEM

5.01.05 For each data base (AS LISTED IN 4.00) accessed by this system for front-and-back checking, what information is reviewed?

DATA BASE	ACCESSED	TYPE OF INFORMATION						
		GROSS		PROPERTY	EMPLOYMENT	HOUSEHOLD	OTHER	
		WAGES	INCOME	BENEFITS	VALUE	STATUS	COMPOSITION	
a. DES wages								
b. UI benefits								
c. SSA wages								
d. SSA self-employment								
e. SSA benefits								
f. SSI benefits								
g. State tax files								
h. Bank records - accounts								
i. Bank records - transactions								
j. DRV records								
k. AFDC files								
l. Adult general assistance files								
m. Medical records								
n. Medicare records								
o. IRS 1099s								
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)								
_____								
q. Other (SPECIFY)								
_____								
r. Other (SPECIFY)								
_____								

## SIXTH SYSTEM

6.01.02 For each data base (AS LISTED IN 4.00) accessed by this system for front-and-back checking, what information is reviewed?

DATA BASE	ACCESSED	TYPE OF INFORMATION						
		GROSS		PROPERTY	EMPLOYMENT	HOUSEHOLD	OTHER	
		WAGES	INCOME	BENEFITS	VALUE	STATUS	COMPOSITION	
a. DES wages								
b. UI benefits								
c. SSA wages								
d. SSA self-employment								
e. SSA benefits								
f. SSI benefits								
g. State tax files								
h. Bank records - accounts								
i. Bank records - transactions								
j. DRV records								
k. AFDC files								
l. Adult general assistance files								
m. Medical records								
n. Medicare records								
o. IRS 1099s								
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)								
_____								
q. Other (SPECIFY)								
_____								
r. Other (SPECIFY)								
_____								

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
6.05 In an income or wage level discrepancy used for triggering identification of front-end matching on this system?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 6.09).....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
6.06 What dollar discrepancy amount is used (i.e., the difference between income the recipient reports and what is reported by the external data sources)?						
DOLLAR AMOUNT.....	[ ] [ ] [ ]	[ ] [ ] [ ]	[ ] [ ] [ ]	[ ] [ ] [ ]	[ ] [ ] [ ]	[ ] [ ] [ ]
PER TIME PERIOD						
NONE.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
WEEK.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
MONTH.....	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
QUARTER.....	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...
YEAR.....	...5...	...5...	...5...	...5...	...5...	...5...
OTHER.....	...6...	...6...	...6...	...6...	...6...	...6...
(SPECIFY).....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	[ ] [ ]	[ ] [ ]	[ ] [ ]	[ ] [ ]	[ ] [ ]	[ ] [ ]
6.07 Are any other non-wage or income discrepancy codes or threshold methods used for identifying a match?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 6.09).....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
6.08 Please describe.						

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
6.09 How does the information on front-end matches get to the local offices?						
ON LINE.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
MACHINE READABLE REPORT.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
WRITTEN MATCH REPORTS.....	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
6.10 How much time elapses between when the front-end match is performed and the time the local offices receive the information?						
LESS THAN 1 DAY.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
1 TO 7 DAYS.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
1 TO 3 WEEKS.....	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
1 TO 4 MONTHS.....	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...
OTHER.....	...5...	...5...	...5...	...5...	...5...	...5...
(SPECIFY).....						
(SPECIFY).....						
6.11 What is included in the match report that is sent to the local programs on front-end cases matched from this system? (OBTAIN COPY OF A TYPICAL MATCH REPORT; NARRATIVE IF NECESSARY.)						
6.12 Are the front-end applicant case matches from this system prioritized in any way at the state level for subsequent follow-up?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 6.15).....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...

	First System		Second System		Third System		Fourth System		Fifth System		Sixth System	
6.13 On what factors are they prioritized? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
AMOUNT OF BENEFIT AUTHORIZATION.....	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...
AMOUNT EXCEEDING DISCREPANCY RANGE.....	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...
ACTIVE/INACTIVE STATUS.....	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...
OTHER.....	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...	...1	0...
(SPECIFY).....	_____		_____		_____		_____		_____		_____	
(SPECIFY).....	_____		_____		_____		_____		_____		_____	
	_____		_____		_____		_____		_____		_____	
6.14 Is this prioritizing process automated?												
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
6.15 Does the state have established procedures that local programs must follow in processing applicant cases identified through this match system?												
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 6.18)...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
6.16 Can the state office monitor what's happening to a "matched" case?												
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 6.18)...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
6.17 Is this tracking or follow-up process automated?												
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
6.18 What is the responsibility of state and local staff to monitor the status of follow-up on applicant cases identified through this match system? Could you please describe how this tracking system works. NARRATIVE.						
6.19 Are local offices required to submit regular reports to the state on the status of actions taken on cases matched by this system?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 6.21).....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
6.20 What is the schedule or frequency of reports that the local programs must submit to the state on the status of follow-up on applicant cases identified through this match system?						
WEEKLY.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
MONTHLY.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
QUARTERLY.....	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
OTHER.....	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...
(SPECIFY).....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□
6.21 What information must local programs report to the state on the status of follow-up on cases identified through this match system? (NOTE: THIS INFORMATION MAY BE AVAILABLE IN THE MANUAL IF PROVIDED; NARRATIVE IF NECESSARY.)						

# MODULE 7: OUTCOMES - FRONT-END MATCHING

(NOTE ALL THIS INFORMATION MAY BE IN THE SYSTEM REPORTS IF PROVIDED.)

		First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
7.00	Do you have any monthly or annual data available on the number of inquiries or outcomes or other such activity about food stamp applicant matches with this system?						
	YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
	NO.....(GO TO 8.00).....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
7.01	Please provide the total number of front-end food stamp <u>inquiries</u> each month with this match system, or the annual or average monthly number if the total is not available.						
7.02	Please provide the total number of front-end food stamp <u>raw hits</u> (actual number of matches) each month with <u>this</u> system, or the average monthly number if the total is not available.						
7.03	Please provide the total number of food stamp <u>applications denied</u> , each month as a result of the front-end matching with <u>this</u> system, or the annual or average monthly number of denials if the total is not available.						
7.04	Please provide the total number of new food stamp cases where <u>benefits were corrected</u> , each month as a result of front-end matching with <u>this</u> system, or the average monthly number of reductions if the total is not available.						
7.05	Please provide the actual number of food stamp applicant <u>matches dropped from this</u> system because the variance identified was too small, or based on further investigation no error existed, or give the average annual or average monthly number of matches subsequently dropped if the total is not available.						

C-30

FIRST SYSTEM

	1984									
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES		NUMBER OF RAW HITS		NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS		NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED		NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED	
JAN										
FEB										
MAR										
APR										
MAY										
JUNE										
JULY										
AUG										
SEPT										
OCT										
NOV										
DEC										
AVE MO										
ANNUAL										

	1985									
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES		NUMBER OF RAW HITS		NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS		NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED		NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED	
JAN										
FEB										
MAR										
APR										
MAY										
JUNE										
JULY										
AUG										
SEPT										
OCT										
NOV										
DEC										
AVE MO										
ANNUAL										

	1986 (FIRST QUARTER)									
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES		NUMBER OF RAW HITS		NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS		NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED		NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED	
JAN										
FEB										
MAR										
APR										
MAY										
JUNE										
JULY										
AUG										
SEPT										
OCT										
NOV										
DEC										
AVE MO										
ANNUAL										



## SECOND SYSTEM

1984					
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES	NUMBER OF RAM HITS	NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS	NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED	NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED
JAN					
FEB					
MAR					
APR					
MAY					
JUNE					
JULY					
AUG					
SEPT					
OCT					
NOV					
DEC					
AVE NO					
ANNUAL					

  

1985					
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES	NUMBER OF RAM HITS	NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS	NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED	NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED
JAN					
FEB					
MAR					
APR					
MAY					
JUNE					
JULY					
AUG					
SEPT					
OCT					
NOV					
DEC					
AVE NO					
ANNUAL					

  

1986 (FIRST QUARTER)					
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES	NUMBER OF RAM HITS	NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS	NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED	NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED
JAN					
FEB					
MAR					
APR					
MAY					
JUNE					
JULY					
AUG					
SEPT					
OCT					
NOV					
DEC					
AVE NO					
ANNUAL					

# THIRD SYSTEM

	1984									
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES		NUMBER OF RAM HITS		NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS		NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED		NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED	
JAN										
FEB										
MAR										
APR										
MAY										
JUNE										
JULY										
AUG										
SEPT										
OCT										
NOV										
DEC										
AVE NO										
ANNUAL										

	1985									
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES		NUMBER OF RAM HITS		NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS		NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED		NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED	
JAN										
FEB										
MAR										
APR										
MAY										
JUNE										
JULY										
AUG										
SEPT										
OCT										
NOV										
DEC										
AVE NO										
ANNUAL										

	1986 (FIRST QUARTER)									
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES		NUMBER OF RAM HITS		NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS		NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED		NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED	
JAN										
FEB										
MAR										
APR										
MAY										
JUNE										
JULY										
AUG										
SEPT										
OCT										
NOV										
DEC										
AVE NO										
ANNUAL										

## FOURTH SYSTEM

1984																			
NUMBER OF INQUIRIES				NUMBER OF RAW BITS				NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS				NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED				NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED			
JAN																			
FEB																			
MAR																			
APR																			
MAY																			
JUNE																			
JULY																			
AUG																			
SEPT																			
OCT																			
NOV																			
DEC																			
AVE MO																			
ANNUAL																			

1985													
NUMBER OF INQUIRIES				NUMBER OF RAW BITS				NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS		NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED		NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED	
JAN													
FEB													
MAR													
APR													
MAY													
JUNE													
JULY													
AUG													
SEPT													
OCT													
NOV													
DEC													
AVE MO													
ANNUAL													

1986 (FIRST QUARTER)																			
NUMBER OF INQUIRIES				NUMBER OF RAW BITS				NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS				NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED				NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED			
JAN																			
FEB																			
MAR																			
APR																			
MAY																			
JUNE																			
JULY																			
AUG																			
SEPT																			
OCT																			
NOV																			
DEC																			
AVE MO																			
ANNUAL																			

CM-14

## 1984

[illegible]

# SIXTH SYSTEM

1984														
NUMBER OF INQUIRIES			NUMBER OF RAM HITS			NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS			NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED			NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED		
JAN														
FEB														
MAR														
APR														
MAY														
JUNE														
JULY														
AUG														
SEPT														
OCT														
NOV														
DEC														
AVE NO														
ANNUAL														

1985												
NUMBER OF INQUIRIES			NUMBER OF RAM HITS			NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS		NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED		NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED		
JAN												
FEB												
MAR												
APR												
MAY												
JUNE												
JULY												
AUG												
SEPT												
OCT												
NOV												
DEC												
AVE NO												
ANNUAL												

1986 (FIRST QUARTER)															
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES			NUMBER OF RAM HITS			NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS			NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED			NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED		
JAN															
FEB															
MAR															
APR															
MAY															
JUNE															
JULY															
AUG															
SEPT															
OCT															
NOV															
DEC															
AVE MO															
ANNUAL															

# MODULE 8: ON-GOING MATCHING

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
8.00 Is this match system used for on-going matching (after initial certification) in food stamps?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 9.08).....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
8.01 When was this match system first used for on-going matching?						
MONTH.....						
YEAR.....	19	19	19	19	19	19
8.02 What parts of the state are covered by this system for on-going matching?						
STATEWIDE.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
PART STATE ONLY.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
(SPECIFY).....						
8.03 What types of cases are covered by this system for on-going matching?						
ENTIRE CASELOAD.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
FOOD STAMP/APDC CASES.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
FOOD STAMP EMPLOYED CASES.....	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
OTHER.....	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...
(SPECIFY).....						
(SPECIFY).....						
(SPECIFY).....						

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
8.04 When is the matching of on-going food stamp cases done?						
AT RECERTIFICATION.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
MONTHLY.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
QUARTERLY.....	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
OTHER.....	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...
(SPECIFY).....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□

## FIRST SYSTEM

B.O.S. 71 For each data base (AS LISTED IN 4.000) accessed by this system for on-going matching at food stamp, what information is reviewed? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

DATA BASE	ACCESSED	TYPE OF INFORMATION							
		GROSS WAGES	GROSS INCOME	BENEFITS	PROPERTY VALUE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW)	
a. D.S. wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
b. U. benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
c. S.A. wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
d. S.A. self-employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
e. S.A. benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
f. S.S. benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
g. State tax files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
j. D.V. records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
k. AFIC files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
m. Medicaid records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
n. Medicare records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
_____									
q. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
_____									
r. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
_____									

## SECOND SYSTEM

B.O.S. 02 For each data base (AS LISTED IN 4.000) accessed by this system for on-going matching, what information is reviewed? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

DATA BASE	ACCESSED	TYPE OF INFORMATION							
		GROSS WAGES	GROSS INCOME	BENEFITS	PROPERTY VALUE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW)	
a. DES wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
b. UI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
c. SSA wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
e. SSA benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
f. SSI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
g. State tax files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
j. D.V. records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
k. AFIC files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
m. Medicaid records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
n. Medicare records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
p. Records from other States (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
_____									
q. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
_____									
r. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
_____									



## THIRD SYSTEM

0.05,01 For each data base (AS LISTED IN 4.000 accessed by this system for on-going matching of food stamp, what information is reviewed? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

DATA BASE	ACCESSED	TYPE OF INFORMATION						
		WAGES	GROSS INCOME	BENEFITS	PROPERTY VALUE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW)
a. DES wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
b. UI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
c. SSA wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
e. SSA benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
f. SSI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
g. State tax files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
j. EDV records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
k. AFDC files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
m. Medicaid records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
n. Medicare records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____								
q. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____								
r. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____								

## FOURTH SYSTEM

0.05,01 For each data base (AS LISTED IN 4.000 accessed by this system for on-going matching, what information is reviewed? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

DATA BASE	ACCESSED	TYPE OF INFORMATION						
		WAGES	GROSS INCOME	BENEFITS	PROPERTY VALUE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW)
a. DES wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
b. UI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
c. SSA wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
e. SSA benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
f. SSI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
g. State tax files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
j. EDV records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
k. AFDC files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
m. Medicaid records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
n. Medicare records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
o. IRS 1099s	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
p. Records from other states (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____								
q. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____								
r. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____								

FIFTH SYSTEM

0.05.05 For each data base (AS LISTED IN 4.00) accessed by this system for on-going watching, if food stamp, what information is reviewed? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

DATA BASE	ACCESSED	TYPE OF INFORMATION						OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW)
		GROSS WAGES	INCOME	PROPERTY VALUE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION		
a. DES wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
b. UI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
c. SSA wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
e. SSA benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
f. SSI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
g. State tax files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
j. DRV records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
k. AFDC files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
m. Medical records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
n. Medicare records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
o. IRS 1040s	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
p. Record from other states (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____								1
q. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____								1
r. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____								

SIXTH SYSTEM

0.05.06 For each data base (AS LISTED IN 4.00) accessed by this system for on-going watching, what information is reviewed? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

DATA BASE	ACCESSED	TYPE OF INFORMATION						OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW)
		GROSS WAGES	INCOME	PROPERTY VALUE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION		
a. DES wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
b. UI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
c. SSA wages	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
d. SSA self-employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
e. SSA benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
f. SSI benefits	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
g. State tax files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
h. Bank records - accounts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
i. Bank records - transactions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
j. DRV records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
k. AFDC files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
l. Adult general assistance files	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
m. Medical records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
n. Medicare records	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
o. IRS 1040s	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
p. Record from other states (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____								
q. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____								
r. Other (SPECIFY)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____								

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
8.06 Is an income or wage discrepancy level used for triggering identification of on-going matching on this system?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 8.10).....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
8.07 What dollar discrepancy amount is used (i.e., the difference between income the recipient reports and what is reported by the external data source)?						
DOLLAR AMOUNT.....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
SPECIFY PER TIME PERIOD						
NONE.....1	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
WEEK.....2	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
MONTH.....3	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
QUARTER.....4	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...
YEAR.....5	...5...	...5...	...5...	...5...	...5...	...5...
OTHER.....6	...6...	...6...	...6...	...6...	...6...	...6...
(SPECIFY).....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
8.08 Are any other non-wage or income discrepancy codes or threshold methods used for identifying a match?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 8.10).....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
8.09 Please describe.						

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
8.10 How does information on on-going food stamp matches get to the local offices?						
ON LINE.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
MACHINE READABLE REPORTS.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
WRITTEN MATCH REPORTS.....	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
8.11 How much time elapses between when the front-end match is performed and the time the local offices receive the information?						
LESS THAN 1 DAY.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
2 TO 7 DAYS.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
1 TO 3 WEEKS.....	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
1 TO 6 MONTHS.....	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...
OTHER.....	...5...	...5...	...5...	...5...	...5...	...5...
(SPECIFY).....	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>
8.12 What is included in the match report that is sent to the local program on on-going cases matched from this system? (OBTAIN COPY OF A TYPICAL MATCH REPORT; NARRATIVE IF NECESSARY.)						
8.13 Are the on-going case matches from this match system prioritized in any way at the state level for subsequent follow-up?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 8.16)...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...



	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
8.18 In the tracking process for following up on ongoing cases identified through this matching system automated?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
8.19 What is the responsibility of state and local staff to monitor the status of follow-up on applicant cases identified through this matching system? Would you please describe how this tracking system works? NARRATIVE.						
8.20 Are local offices required to submit regular reports to the state on the status of actions taken on cases matched by this system?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 8.22).....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
8.21 What is the schedule or frequency of reports that the local programs must submit to the state on the status of follow-up on applicant cases identified through this matching system?						
WEEKLY.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
MONTHLY.....	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...	...2...
QUARTERLY.....	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...	...3...
OTHER.....	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...	...4...
(SPECIFY).....						
	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
8.22 What information must local programs report to the state on the status of follow-up on on-going cases identified through this matching system? (NOTE: THIS MAY BE AVAILABLE IN THE MANUAL IF PROVIDED.) NARRATIVE.						

# MODULE 9: OUTCOMES - ON-GOING MATCHING

(NOTE: ALL INFORMATION IN THIS SECTION MAY BE IN THE SYSTEM REPORTS IF PROVIDED.)

	First System	Second System	Third System	Fourth System	Fifth System	Sixth System
9.00 Do you have any monthly or annual data available on the number of inquiries or outcomes or other such activity about food stamp applicant matches with this system?						
YES.....	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...	...1...
NO.....(GO TO 10.00)....	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...	...0...
9.01 Please provide the total number of ongoing food stamp <u>inquiries</u> each month with this match system, or the annual or average monthly number if the total is not available.						
9.02 Please provide the number of ongoing food stamp <u>raw hits</u> on (actual number of matches) each month with <u>this system</u> , or the average monthly number if the total is not available.						
9.03 Please provide the total number of food stamp <u>applications denied</u> , each month as a result of the ongoing matching with <u>this system</u> , or the average monthly number if the total is not available.						
9.04 Please provide the total number of new food stamp <u>cases where benefits were corrected</u> , each month as a result of ongoing matching with <u>this system</u> , or the average monthly number of reductions if the total is not available.						
9.05 Please provide the actual number of food stamp applicant <u>matches dropped from this system</u> , because the variance identified was too small, or based on further investigation, no error existed, or give the average annual or average monthly number of matches subsequently dropped if the total is not available.						



FIRST SYSTEM

1984				
NUMBER OF INQUIRIES	NUMBER OF RAW HITS	NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS	NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED	NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED
JAN				
FEB				
MAR				
APR				
MAY				
JUNE				
JULY				
AUG				
SEPT				
OCT				
NOV				
DEC				
AVE MO				
ANNUAL				

1985				
NUMBER OF INQUIRIES	NUMBER OF RAW HITS	NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS	NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED	NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED
JAN				
FEB				
MAR				
APR				
MAY				
JUNE				
JULY				
AUG				
SEPT				
OCT				
NOV				
DEC				
AVE MO				
ANNUAL				

1986 (FIRST QUARTER)				
NUMBER OF INQUIRIES	NUMBER OF RAW HITS	NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS	NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED	NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED
JAN				
FEB				
MAR				
APR				
MAY				
JUNE				
JULY				
AUG				
SEPT				
OCT				
NOV				
DEC				
AVE MO				
ANNUAL				

SECOND SYSTEM

	1984									
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES		NUMBER OF RAM HITS		NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS		NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED		NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED	
JAN										
FEB										
MAR										
APR										
MAY										
JUNE										
JULY										
AUG										
SEPT										
OCT										
NOV										
DEC										
AVE MO										
ANNUAL										

	1985									
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES		NUMBER OF RAM HITS		NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS		NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED		NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED	
JAN										
FEB										
MAR										
APR										
MAY										
JUNE										
JULY										
AUG										
SEPT										
OCT										
NOV										
DEC										
AVE MO										
ANNUAL										

	1986 (FIRST QUARTER)									
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES		NUMBER OF RAM HITS		NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS		NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED		NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED	
JAN										
FEB										
MAR										
APR										
MAY										
JUNE										
JULY										
AUG										
SEPT										
OCT										
NOV										
DEC										
AVE MO										
ANNUAL										

THIRD SYSTEM

	1984																			
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES				NUMBER OF RAW HITS				NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS				NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED				NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED			
JAN																				
FEB																				
MAR																				
APR																				
MAY																				
JUNE																				
JULY																				
AUG																				
SEPT																				
OCT																				
NOV																				
DEC																				
AVE MO																				
ANNUAL																				

	1985																			
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES				NUMBER OF RAW HITS				NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS				NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED				NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED			
JAN																				
FEB																				
MAR																				
APR																				
MAY																				
JUNE																				
JULY																				
AUG																				
SEPT																				
OCT																				
NOV																				
DEC																				
AVE MO																				
ANNUAL																				

	1986 (FIRST QUARTER)																			
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES				NUMBER OF RAW HITS				NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS				NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED				NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED			
JAN																				
FEB																				
MAR																				
APR																				
MAY																				
JUNE																				
JULY																				
AUG																				
SEPT																				
OCT																				
NOV																				
DEC																				
AVE MO																				
ANNUAL																				

## FOURTH SYSTEM

1984																			
NUMBER OF INQUIRIES				NUMBER OF RAW HITS				NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS				NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED				NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED			
JAN																			
FEB																			
MAR																			
APR																			
MAY																			
JUNE																			
JULY																			
AUG																			
SEPT																			
OCT																			
NOV																			
DEC																			
AVE NO																			
ANNUAL																			

1985										
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES		NUMBER OF RAW HITS		NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS		NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED		NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED	
JAN										
FEB										
MAR										
APR										
MAY										
JUNE										
JULY										
AUG										
SEPT										
OCT										
NOV										
DEC										
AVE MO										
ANNUAL										

1986 (FIRST QUARTER)																			
NUMBER OF INQUIRIES				NUMBER OF RAW HITS				NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS				NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED				NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED			
JAN																			
FEB																			
MAR																			
APR																			
MAY																			
JUNE																			
JULY																			
AUG																			
SEPT																			
OCT																			
NOV																			
DEC																			
AVE NO																			
ANNUAL																			

## C-52

1983					
NUMBER OF INQUIRIES	NUMBER OF RAW HITS	NUMBER OF POOD STAMP DENIALS	NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED	NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED	
JAN	.	.	.	.	.
FEB	.	.	.	.	.
MAR	.	.	.	.	.
APR	.	.	.	.	.
MAY	.	.	.	.	.
JUNE	.	.	.	.	.
JULY	.	.	.	.	.
AUG	.	.	.	.	.
SEPT	.	.	.	.	.
OCT	.	.	.	.	.
NOV	.	.	.	.	.
DEC	.	.	.	.	.
AVE MO	.	.	.	.	.
ANNUAL	.	.	.	.	.

CM-92

# SIXTH SYSTEM

	1984				
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES	NUMBER OF RAM HITS	NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS	NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED	NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED
JAN					
FEB					
MAR					
APR					
MAY					
JUNE					
JULY					
AUG					
SEPT					
OCT					
NOV					
DEC					
AVE MO					
ANNUAL					

	1985				
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES	NUMBER OF RAM HITS	NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS	NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED	NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED
JAN					
FEB					
MAR					
APR					
MAY					
JUNE					
JULY					
AUG					
SEPT					
OCT					
NOV					
DEC					
AVE MO					
ANNUAL					

	1986 (FIRST QUARTER)				
	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES	NUMBER OF RAM HITS	NUMBER OF FOOD STAMP DENIALS	NUMBER OF CASES CORRECTED	NUMBER OF MATCHES DROPPED
JAN					
FEB					
MAR					
APR					
MAY					
JUNE					
JULY					
AUG					
SEPT					
OCT					
NOV					
DEC					
AVE MO					
ANNUAL					

MODULE 10: EFFECTIVENESS

9.06 INTERVIEW  
CHECK ITEM

IS THERE ANOTHER MATCH SYSTEM BEING  
USED FOR FOOD STAMPS THAT WE HAVE  
NOT DISCUSSED?

YES.....(GO BACK TO MODULE 2 AND  
REPEAT MODULES 2 TO 9).....1

NO.....(GO TO 10.0).....2

10.0 Finally, we would like your personal professional opinion about the effectiveness of computer matching and about which of the various systems are most effective or least effective. Do you feel computer matching in general is worthwhile? NARRATIVE.

10.1 Of the systems we have discussed, which are most effective in terms of (a) reducing the number of certifications, (b) reducing error rates and (c) increasing the number of application denials? NARRATIVE.